

THE
WESTMINSTER
REVIEW.

JANUARY TO JUNE
(*INCLUSIVE*)
1898.

"Truth can never be confirmed enough,
Though doubts did ever sleep."

SHAKESPEARE.

Wahrheiteliebe zeigt sich darin, daß man überall das Gute zu finden und zu schützen weiß.

GÖTTE.

VOL. CXLIX.

LONDON:
FREDERICK WARNE AND COMPANY,
15 BEDFORD STREET, STRAND.
MCCCXCVIII.

Ballantyne Press
BAILLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
LONDON AND GLASGOW

THE
WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CXLIX. No. 1.—JANUARY 1898.

THE CASE OF CAPTAIN DREYFUS.

A COMPARISON OF THE PROCEDURE OF ENGLISH
AND FRENCH COURTS-MARTIAL.

It would be almost impossible to imagine a case better calculated than that of Captain Dreyfus to bring clearly before the mind the differences between justice as administered by civil tribunals and the procedure of courts-martial. These differences are in part fundamental and universal; due to the fact that courts-martial are instituted for the maintenance, chiefly, of a high standard of discipline among the members of a particular body, or particular bodies, of men. But it is submitted that such discipline may be maintained, and that it is maintained here in England, without any such wide divergence from ordinary legal procedure as took place on the trial of Captain Dreyfus. And it is proposed in the present article to draw some comparisons between the proceedings on that famous trial, and also during the preliminary investigation, with similar proceedings in England.

Arrested towards the end of the year 1894, M. Dreyfus has been confined at the convict station on Devil's Island, French Guiana wellnigh three years. In September of last year a circumstantial account of his escape reached Europe. It was unfounded; but its immediate consequence was that men's minds were agitated upon the question of his guilt or innocence. This agitation became general and intense, and in December last culminated in interpellations addressed to the Government, and in riots directed against the convict's defenders in the Press and in the Senate. And all this because the trial was conducted in secret!

It is not the intention of the present writer to become an advocate in the cause. Others more able and better informed than he have ranged themselves definitively upon the side of the ex-officer, conspicuous among these are M. Scheurer-Kestner, vice-president of the Senate, and M. Zola, besides that excellent journal the *Figaro*; others, like M. Paul de Cassagnac, have been forced to question the justice of the conviction; while others, again, are either convinced of the convict's guilt, or refuse to call in question a sentence once pronounced. But, without his becoming a partisan, there is much in the case worthy of the consideration of any man who views with misgiving any judicial procedure superintended by amateurs (for military officers are little more), especially when such procedure has been conducted in the most profound secrecy, and has confessedly been strongly influenced by political considerations, by that old bogey, "reasons of State." We are not unacquainted with such reasons on this side of the Channel; we have not forgotten the suppression of certain letters and telegrams in the Jameson inquiry; but in both cases the State would have been better served by full disclosure, and I venture to assert that such a reason is absolutely without any solid foundation in nine cases out of every ten in which it is put forward. Moreover, the reason is seldom trusted; it confirms the worst suspicions, and gives play to the most foul aspersions and the most insidious attacks.

It has been roundly asserted by some of his defenders that Dreyfus was persecuted because he was a Jew. Members of that faith are, no doubt, unpopular with a large number of Frenchmen. M. Drumont, in the *Libre Paire*, and others of the same persuasion, have succeeded in making anti-Semitism a power in the country. To those who believe in their creed, a Jew is an outcast, without a country, and without any sentiment of patriotism. Feelings of this kind have probably made many enemies for Dreyfus in the Press and among the masses; but it would be most unjust to impute, without further evidence, and on suspicion merely, any such motives to the body of French officers who sat in judgment on their comrade, Captain Dreyfus. No! their procedure was wrong; but we have no more reason to say, without proof, that they were false to their oaths, than that Dreyfus was to his.

Captain Dreyfus was arrested on October 15, 1894. The preliminary inquiry lasted twenty-seven days. During this time a full and detailed examination into the life of that officer was made; even the letters written to his wife before marriage were examined, and according to the testimony of this lady she was treated with such a want of consideration and respect as amounted to unredeemed cruelty. Moreover, during a great part of the time Dreyfus himself was, it appears, not allowed to communicate with the outside world, and was left in ignorance of the charge against him. It was only

on the first day of November that the public was made aware by a note in the *Éclair* of his arrest. The first inquiry was conducted by M. Paty de Clam. At its termination a second commenced. This was conducted by M. Besson d'Ormescheville, and lasted two months. During its progress General Mercier, then Minister of War, allowed himself to be interviewed. In the *Figaro* of November 28, 1894, may be read as follows :

"I have submitted to the Premier, and to my colleagues, said he (General Mercier) to M. Leser, the crushing reports which have been made to me. I cannot say more (*sic*) since the inquiry is not finished. All that can be affirmed is that the guilt of this officer—(*i.e.*, Dreyfus) is absolutely certain, and that he has had accomplices who are civilians."

Could there possibly be a crueller blow than this? A soldier, not convicted—nay, not yet brought to trial—is publicly condemned by the head of the army, who excuses himself from saying *more* than that the prisoner is certainly guilty. This interview took place, as was mentioned above, during the second preliminary inquiry, and it was subsequent to the interview that the prisoner was brought to trial before officers on whom their chief's words could not fail to have great influence. The fatal error in the conduct of this trial was its profound secrecy; in consequence of such secrecy the wildest rumours have been afloat, and it is extremely difficult to get at any accurate details. The mouths of those who know are shut, while those who know nothing of the proceedings at first hand, but have been making inquiries since, endeavouring in all ways to see behind the veil, flatly contradict one another. There are, however, three statements which are of the greatest importance for forming an opinion upon the merits of this affair: two of them made by actors in the drama, the other by a journal, the *Éclair*, which has all the appearance of having been supplied from official sources.

To take them in order. It was in the month of September 1896 that the *Éclair* took upon itself to defend the Government, and so set forth what was to all appearance the official version of the matter. In the course of that defence it writes as follows :

"The military attachés at the German Embassy sent in September to their colleagues of the Italian Embassy a letter in cipher. This letter left the hands of its authors on the way to those for whom it was intended, but on its course it was cleverly deciphered and photographed.

"It was a letter in the cipher used by the German Embassy. This cipher was known, and it may be that it was of too great a value for the secret of its acquisition to be made public. It will be seen later that this was the reason why the letter in question was not put in at the trial, and why it was only communicated to the judges in secret, and in the consultation room, when the prisoner's counsel was not present."

Referring to this letter the *Éclair* writes: "This was the document which settled the decision of the judges, unanimous and decisive."

To pass to the second of the three statements. M. Bernard Lazare, who has interested himself on behalf of the convict, sent to Maître Demange, the leader of the Paris bar and the counsel for Dreyfus at his trial, a copy of a pamphlet which he had written. In this pamphlet, M. Lazare exhaustively criticises the procedure of the military authorities. The *only* evidence which he discusses is the now famous "bordereau" or memorandum, which was submitted to the examination of experts in handwriting and put in at the trial, and the mysterious letter mentioned by the *Éclair*. Writing on November 25, 1896, Maître Demange replies :

"Dear Sir,—I thank you for having sent me your second pamphlet. I am with you with all my heart in the disinterested and courageous work which you have undertaken. As I told you during the visit which you did me the honour of paying me, *I have never known other charges against Captain Dreyfus than those discussed by you*, and, in spite of your assertion, forgive me if I do not dare to believe in the enormity of a communication being made to the judges behind the back of his counsel.

"All my good wishes go with you, and if I maintain a complete silence towards all who have desired to discuss the Dreyfus affair with me, it is *not because my firm conviction in his innocence has been shaken*, but because that is the only way in which I can reconcile that firm conviction with the respect which I owe to the thing judged.

"E. DEMANGE."

It would appear from this that the only charge of which Maître Demange was aware was in connection with the "bordereau" or memorandum; and, with regard to the handwriting of this, the experts to whom it was submitted were by no means unanimous. Messieurs Bertillon and Charavay were convinced that the writer was Dreyfus; three others could not say so.

The third important statement to which our attention should be directed is that made by General Billot, the Minister for War, in the Chamber of Deputies, and which will be found in the *Times* of Monday, December 6, 1897. General Billot said :

"The Prime Minister has told you that in the circumstances there is no Dreyfus affair. A year ago, in reply to M. Castelin, the Minister of War had occasion to say to you, that Dreyfus had been judged, well judged, and condemned unanimously, by seven of his peers *on the testimony of twenty-seven officers called as witnesses*. Questioned once again the other day, the Government, by the mouth of the Minister of War, declared to you that it considered that the Dreyfus affair had been regularly and justly judged. As for me, in my soul and conscience, as a soldier, as head of the army, I consider the judgment as having been well deserved and Dreyfus as guilty."

On considering these statements, it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that evidence on which the Minister of War now relies—viz., that of twenty-seven officers, although it may have been given during one or other of the preliminary inquiries, was not produced

at the trial, and was unknown to the prisoner's counsel. It is unnecessary to dwell here upon the illegality of any such procedure; it is sufficiently emphasised by Maître Dehange himself in the letter quoted above. The only way of satisfying the general uneasiness and suspicion which such contradictory statements have produced is a *revision of the trial*. It is not for an amateur in French legal procedure to point out how this is to be done; such questions of procedure are sufficiently intricate for the practitioner, but that such a revision is possible was clearly indicated to the Senate on December 7 by M. Méline, the President of the Council.

In consequence of the interest taken in this trial, as well in England as in France, it has been thought desirable to compare the procedure followed in this case with that of trials on similar charges under English law. To start with such an offence as that with which Dreyfus was charged—viz., selling military secrets to the foreigner, is not treason in English law. If it were, that fact alone would prevent the soldier charged from being tried by court-martial, provided the crime were committed in England in time of peace. For by Section 41 of the Army Act, all crimes known to our law may be punished by courts-martial, if committed by persons subject to military law, with the important exceptions of treason, treason-felony, murder, manslaughter, and rape. These latter crimes must be tried by the courts of common law.

The whole code of procedure before our courts-martial will be found in the rules drawn up in pursuance of Section 70 of the Army Act, signified under the hand of a Secretary of State, and presented to Parliament. On this subject a friend of the present writer, an officer of high standing and of great experience, writes as follows:

"Courts-martial are *open courts*. The public is admitted. There is no secrecy of inquiry. Before the trial the charges must always be communicated to the prisoner, and explained to him. A copy must be given him (except on active service). The names of the officers by whom he is to be tried must be communicated to him as soon as they are appointed. He must have a proper opportunity to prepare his defence, liberty to communicate with his witnesses, and his legal adviser, who may be counsel or other friend. As the court at the trial is an open one the prisoner may be, and usually is, present during the preliminary proceedings. The prisoner may object to the court, or any member of the court, if reason be shown. The rules of evidence are the same as in the civil courts; counsel for prisoner has the same rights as the prisoner. All evidence is in public, and the public and press may be present, as far as the court will allow, in their thousands. I have never myself seen the public rush to these trials, but there is no reason why they should not; occasionally a few stray officers and a few stray 'tommies' come in, but it is very rare that many of the general public are present, unless it is a case which has excited some local interest, then the local press are always there."

In April 1888 Major Templer was tried and acquitted on a charge

very similar to that for which Captain Dreyfus was arraigned. In the *Times* of April 7, 1888, we may read as follows :

"The general court-martial, under the presidency of Colonel Berthon, R.A., for the trial of Major Templer, 7th Battalion King's Royal Rifles, and Instructor in Ballooning at the School of Military Engineering, reassembled at Brompton Barracks yesterday morning. The charges against the prisoner were for scandalous conduct unbecoming an officer in making false statements to Major Elsdale and Colonel Durnford, his superior officers, and for divulging secrets as to the construction of military balloons in contravention of the Army Discipline Act. *The court was crowded, great interest being taken in the proceedings, and many ladies were present.*"

Is the judgment of a court-martial final? In English law the acquittal of a prisoner by a court-martial is final ; but a conviction and sentence are not final until confirmed by a superior authority. In the case of an officer, this authority is the Sovereign, or some officer having authority to confirm, either mediately or immediately, from the Sovereign. The confirming authority can send the case back for revision, or he can refuse to confirm. Such refusal annuls the whole proceeding.

"There is no other appeal against the finding and sentence of a court-martial when acting within the scope of its jurisdiction. The decision of the confirming authority is final : and, if wrong, irretrievable,¹ other than as an appeal—not of right, but for mercy—to the person of the Sovereign (acting not through his judges, but through his political Ministers) may secure relief. . . . Formerly, in doubtful cases of capital or penal sentences, to aid the confirming officers and to free them from all personal responsibility, the practice of the Crown was to refer the record of the proceedings to the decision of the twelve [common law] judges. . . . In the present day, the Secretary of State would refer the record to the law officers for report. This was done in March 1866, when a sentence of capital punishment was awarded by a court-martial against a prisoner."

The case of the mutineers of the *Bounty* may be cited as one in which a prisoner was discharged because, on reference by the Crown, the common-law judges decided against the legality of the sentence by a court-martial.²

Now let us examine and sum up the differences between the procedure in the actual Dreyfus trial and that which would have been pursued in this country. The trial was secret; here, as in the case of Major Templer, it would have been in public. The prisoner would not have been kept in ignorance of the charge against him for long and many days; he would have had a full opportunity of communicating with his legal advisers and witnesses; his previous bad character (if any), the follies of his youth (if any), his poverty (if any), and similar extraneous matter, would not have been received

¹ Cf. "Clode on Military and Martial Law," p. 143.

² Cf. Erskinearquendo in *R. v. Siddis*, 1 East p. 310.

in evidence against him. Moreover, no such ungenerous and disgraceful action as that of the Minister of War, in publicly, through the press, declaring his conviction of the prisoner's guilt before he had been brought to trial, could, on any imaginable hypothesis, have occurred in this country. There is yet a graver charge : it is, that statement put forward by the *Éclair*, apparently inspired, as to the secret production and the effect of a certain letter. If this statement be true, the prisoner was condemned on evidence which was no evidence ; he was illegally condemned even according to French law. To any one accustomed to the fair and open procedure of English courts of justice, the whole inquiry and trial seems a most lamentable example of distorted ingenuity in the science of prisoner-baiting.

E. AUSTIN FARLEIGH.

FREEDOM OF TEACHING IN AMERICA.

DOUBTLESS many thoughtful Englishmen, though puzzled at the strange case of President Andrews and the Brown University, were not quite prepared to accept the conclusions reached by such London journals as the *Spectator* and the *Chronicle* in their leaders upon that episode. These journals saw, in the practical dismissal of President Andrews, striking evidence of the growing aggressiveness of American wealth. The *Spectator* went so far as to declare that "apparently" the intention of the American capitalists "is first to convert the United States into a powerful oligarchy, and then to extend the sway of that oligarchy over other lands." On no other theory could it explain the policy of stifling criticism, subsidising the pulpit, buying the Press, controlling the federal senate, and muzzling the colleges. How much fact or truth is there behind these assertions and suppositions? The significance of the question justifies a review of this Brown University controversy, the end of which is not yet.

Has there in reality arisen such a problem of that of the *Freiheit von den Leben* in "free America"? In a despotic country the effort of the Government to direct and control university teaching is natural enough. What freedom of teaching means to reactionary rulers is indicated by the frank and familiar dictum attributed to Frederick William III. of Prussia—namely, that university professors were free to teach anything they pleased, provided they did not advance any views of which he disapproved. To-day, in spite of Emperor William's mediævalism and absolutist pretensions, freedom of teaching is recognised as a sacred principle even in Prussia. That in the democratic United States there should be any question raised as to propriety of absolute freedom of teaching must indeed be incomprehensible to European minds.

Yet it is true that the question has been raised, and raised in a way to amaze and alarm those Americans whose professions of toleration and liberalism are more than empty sounds and vain phrases. American universities do not, as a rule, depend upon State aid and endowments. Private wealth practically supports the great institutions of learning in this country. Interference, in the nature of things, can only come from the wealthy patrons of the colleges. Owing to the rivalry among these institutions, it is within the power

of the rich to influence, if not to dictate, the course of teaching. To what extent have they attempted to use or abuse their power? Three years ago, in connection with the involuntary retirement of Professor Bemis, of the University of Chicago, the cry was raised that the founder and supporter of the institution, Mr. Rockefeller, the head of the Standard Oil combination, had resented the socialistic views of Professor Bemis, and, directly or indirectly, ordered his dismissal. The anti-plutocratic press took up the cudgels for the freedom of teaching and non-interference, and a spirited discussion ensued. But the present writer has been assured by a conscientious and liberal-minded trustee of the University of Chicago that Mr. Rockefeller had nothing to do with Professor Bemis's removal, and that he has scrupulously refrained from expressing the mildest opinion concerning the teaching of the professors. There is, moreover, independent evidence tending to negative the suspicion that the Bemis affair, unpleasant as it was, in any wise involved the great principle of freedom of teaching.

The case of President Andrews stands alone, and must be treated as a new departure. Unfortunately, there can be no question that here we are confronted with a flagrant violation of the principle named. The case discloses a sentiment which may well arouse apprehension. It argues a bigotry, a fanaticism, an intolerance, and a narrow-mindedness on the part of the gold-standard adherents perfectly appalling and incredible. Let me briefly recall the facts.

Dr. E. B. Andrews, distinguished as an educator, author, and thinker, and long regarded as a prominent American advocate of bimetallism (he was one of the American delegates to the Silver Conference at Brussels), gave his moral support, in the last national campaign, to the free-silver party and candidates. He made no free-silver speeches, he displayed no "pernicious activity"—to use a Cleveland term—against the gold theory, but in a private letter and one newspaper interview he expressed, in guarded and moderate language, the belief that independent free coinage of gold and silver by the United States would not reduce the country to a single silver standard. He had been an "international bimetallist" of the school to which the late President Francis A. Walker belonged, but he had, after reflection and further study, concluded that even without international co-operation the United States could safely open its mints to the free coinage of silver at the old ratio of sixteen to one. It should be stated, in passing, that "international bimetallism" was not an issue in the late elections. Even those gold advocates who ignorantly and absurdly maintain that international bimetallism is as immoral and economically unsound as "national" bimetallism, who brand every advocate of the double standard as an ignoramus and lunatic, did not care to attack such American economists as

President Walker and such statesmen as Senator Hoar. The Bryan platform declared for free coinage without the aid or consent of other countries; and it was this kind of bimetallism which was fiercely and passionately assailed as involving repudiation, disaster, and dishonour. Naturally, the position of the President of Brown University as a convert to national free coinage was a source of strength and delight to the Bryanites, and of irritation and annoyance to the gold-standard men. There were murmers and faint protests against the alleged "abuse" of his office by President Andrews, but no gold politician or newspaper ventured to demand his removal by the corporation.

The first intimation that reached the public pointing to trouble in the institution was the following statement, which was made public on July 16:

"To the REV. E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, D.D., President of Brown University.

"In compliance with your request, the undersigned, members of a committee appointed at the last meeting of the Corporation of Brown University, make the following statement.

"The committee was appointed under the following resolution, to wit:

"Resolved, That a committee, consisting of the Chancellor, Judge Durfee, and Professor Wayland, be appointed to confer with the President in regard to the interests of the University."

"The resolution was passed after remarks from several members of the Corporation showing more specifically the reason for it. The makers of these remarks expressed the highest appreciation of the services rendered by the President in increasing and diversifying the educational facilities and efficiency of the University and in multiplying the number of the students resorting to it, and at the same time professed for him personally the warmest admiration and regard. They signified a wish for change in only one particular, having reference to his views upon a question which constituted the leading issue in the recent Presidential election, and which is still predominant in national politics—namely, that of the free coinage of silver as legal tender at a ratio of sixteen ounces of silver to one of gold. They considered that the views of the President, as made public by him from time to time, favoured a resumption of such coinage, and expressed the belief that these views were so contrary to the views generally held by the friends of the University, that the University *had already lost gifts and legacies which otherwise would have come or have been assured to it*, and that without change it would in the future *fail to receive the pecuniary support which is requisite to enable it to prosecute with success the grand work on which it has entered*. The change hoped for by them, they proceeded to explain, is not a renunciation of these views, as honestly entertained by him, but a forbearance, out of regard for the interests of the University, to promulgate them, especially when to promulgate them will appeal most strongly to the passions and prejudices of the public. The subscribers understand that it was in pursuance of this hope that the resolution appointing them a committee to confer with the President was passed, and passed, too, it may be added, without a single dissenting voice or vote.

(Signed)

WM. GODDARD.
THOMAS DUFFEE.
FRANCIS WAYLAND.

"July 16, 1897,"

No rational reader requires to be told that this extraordinary communication was an indirect request for Dr. Andrews' resignation. He refused to surrender the "reasonable liberty of utterance" which his predecessors and faculty colleagues had enjoyed, and resigned his presidency as well as his professorship.

The document is signed by distinguished men, but its *naïveté* and puerility would disgrace a schoolboy. No exception is taken on intellectual or moral grounds to Dr. Andrews' views. The trustees admit the doctor's honesty and sincerity. They recognise his services to the institution. They ask him to refrain from expressing his views in order to save the institution its share of the "gifts and legacies." Is not the *Boston Pilot*, a Conservative Catholic journal, justified in saying that the "worst feature of this despicable business is the sordidness and meanness underlying it"?

Several things have to be borne in mind. Brown University was never represented, by word or innuendo, as a free-silver hotbed. The President never expressed free-silver views in his official capacity. He never taught political economy in the University. The professor who does teach economics is *not* a free-silver advocate. In fact, the majority of the faculty dissent from Dr. Andrews' views on free coinage, and have always enjoyed perfect freedom of teaching and utterance under the President. Nor has the institution suffered in any palpable way through public misconstruction of its relation to the silver movement. There has been an unprecedented increase in the number of students; the amount of money annually received has steadily risen, and the institution's rate of growth under President Andrews has been three times as great as the general rate of growth of the other New England colleges.

To the honour of the faculty it is that twenty-four out of the thirty-seven professors and assistant professors have issued a public statement condemnatory of the action of the trustees. Not a shred is left of the pseudo-arguments of the committee and their apologists. The most telling point made by the members of the faculty is that bearing on the question as to whether a president of a college is under obligation to conform his public expressions to the views of the community in which it is placed. They pertinently and properly ask:

"In what sense has it been obligatory on Dr. Andrews to 'represent' the community? The community did not elect him, and has had no official relation to him. If it is the duty of the head of a university in a State like this [a 'sound money' State] to conform to the political views of the majority of its inhabitants, what is his duty in a 'doubtful' State? Must he whiffle around, like the Vicar of Bray, taking care always to side with the majority? There are Western State universities where just such conformity has been exacted, and the disastrous results are well known. . . . It is useless to argue that there is 'no politics' in the present movement, on the ground that the question of the free coinage of silver is a moral question. Every man is prone to think that, while a political

matter about which he cares very little is 'politics,' one about which he cares a great deal is simply a matter of right and wrong, because he is right and his opponent wrong."

Yes, there is politics in this movement, and nothing but politics. Some "great" journals frankly admitted that the "gift and legacy" plea is weak and silly. They declared that Dr. Andrews ought to be dismissed because he preaches "repudiation" and financial heresy. No fair-minded reader needs to be told that this is either malicious libel or appalling ignorance. Dr. Andrews holds that free coinage would be "safe"—that is, that both gold and silver would remain in circulation, and that parity would be maintained. Dr. Andrews may be mistaken, and the very professors who have protested against the action of the corporation think that he is mistaken; but, at any rate, his error is an intellectual one purely. There is no "repudiation" in Dr. Andrews' teaching, although it is perfectly open to them to argue that the *effect* of free coinage would be repudiation. This, however, is the very question at issue, and the gold-standard men first beg it and then arrogate to themselves superior virtue and morality. Gold men have no better logical warrant for charging national bimetallists with "repudiation" and immorality than the latter have for charging them with the intention of robbing debtors and making money dear and scarce in the interest of creditors.

But there are bigoted and fanatical gold men in the United States who know nothing of the present condition of economic science, who are unaware that bimetallism is taught by the leading European professors of political economy, who denounce every bimetallist as a fool and pestilential disturber. How are we to treat the following utterance of the Hon. J. H. Walker, Chairman of the Congressional Committee on Currency and Banking, who, as a member of the Brown University corporation, has this to say in regard to the Andrews case, in which his part is a very prominent one:

"It is the unanimous opinion of the corporation of Brown University that the question upon which Dr. Andrews is at variance with it is far more vital to the well-being of the country than were the questions upon which the civil war was fought; in fact, that this question is fundamental to the continued progress of Christian civilisation."

In other words, to advocate national bimetallism is worse than to support slavery, and no man holding such views as those of Dr. Andrews is morally and mentally fit to preside over or teach in a college. Unfortunately for Mr. Walker, the trustees did not assume any such position. The only consideration that weighed with them was the danger of scaring away "gifts and legacies" of narrow-minded philanthropists. There is, however, another and less offensive excuse advanced by more temperate men than Mr. Walker. Thus, Professor H. L. Wayland, the son of the celebrated Dr.

Francis Wayland, one of the greatest presidents Brown University has had, asks whether it is reasonable to hold that an instructor, a minister, an editor, the president of a bank or of a college, has the right to use his position to give currency and authority to his views "without being open to suggestion from those who have placed him in his position." It is not easy to see what bearing this innocent question has on the Andrews case. What was the "suggestion" made to him? He was virtually told that if he intended to express his earnest belief that free coinage was safe and desirable he had better retire from the presidency. The real point, therefore, is whether *such* suggestions are to be tolerated and encouraged, whether freedom of university teaching and the dignity and independence of educational institutions would not be seriously compromised by the subordination of every interest of colleges to the "gift and legacy" consideration.

Perhaps the spirit of the opposition to Dr. Andrews is best indicated by the following monstrously absurd query of Dr. Wayland: "If the only qualification for a president is freedom, why not at once elect Colonel Ingersoll, unless, indeed, ex-Governor Altgeld has superior qualifications?" This outrageous misrepresentation of the issue ignores the fact that Dr. Andrews is admitted to be an excellent president, and that "freedom" is not demanded as a "qualification," but as the *right* of one concededly qualified and successful. Freedom ought not to be a fatal disqualification in the case of one not only qualified, but tried and found in every way fit and capable.

We are now in a position to amend the verdict of the *Spectator* and the *Chronicle*. It is not strictly true that rich men have ousted Dr. Andrews because his personal opinions are unpalatable to them. The corporation has attempted to forestall the action which it feared. It has anticipated the supposed wishes of the millionaires. It wants gifts and legacies, and thinks that Dr. Andrews' silver views have offended those from whom endowments usually come. It has warned Dr. Andrews against continuing to give offence to the rich. All this, if it means anything, means that, in the opinion of the corporation, the prejudices, fancies, and opinions of the rich must be carefully studied by educational institutions; and not only must nothing objectionable to them be taught in any college, but the presidents and instructors must conceal and suppress their own individual opinions in their intercourse as citizens and social beings with their fellow-men. There is more than an attack on "freedom of teaching" in the action of the corporation. Free silver was never taught at Brown's, hence there can be no objection to the political economy of the college on the part of the most intolerant gold men. The attack is upon the liberty of "reasonable utterance" of the president and faculty outside of the lecture-rooms. Surely this is a startling and unheard-of encroachment.

But the most ominous and disquieting feature of the case is found in the attitude of the American Press towards this extraordinary case. With one exception, the New York "gold" papers have approved the action of the corporation, and have resorted to the most contemptible sophistry in attempting to defend it. In other great "gold" communities there has not been so strong a disposition to uphold the corporation. In Boston and Chicago leading gold-standard journals have had the sagacity and boldness to protest against this audacious assault upon free speech and free teaching. Still, the protestants are in a minority in the "gold" circles, and this it is which may well inspire alarm and disgust.

There is too much intolerance in "free America," too little inclination to credit an opponent with sincerity and correctness. In the discussion of bimetallism, as well as in the discussion of the grave "trust" problem, the apologists for things as they are prefer invective, abuse, and blackguardism to argument. The man who believes in free coinage is represented, not as well-meaning but mistaken, but as a repudiationist and lunatic. The man who demands legislation against trusts is denounced as a mischievous disturber and fire-brand. Patriotism and virtue are the monopoly of the "Conservatives," while those who are dissatisfied and anxious to introduce changes are held up to scorn and execration as "anarchists," demagogues, and "cranks." There are, of course, honourable exceptions among the Conservative journals, but they are few and far between. Justice toward opponents is the exception rather than the rule. The reformers naturally pay the Conservatives in the same coin, and the effect of such mutual suspicion, malice, and bitterness is most disastrous.

The real friends of American liberty, who admire the American Constitution, the great principles of personal right and freedom which it was designed to guarantee, the ideas of government entertained by the founders of the great Republic, and so much of the existing order of things as remains true to the original plan, deplore and "view with alarm"—to use a favourite American "platform" expression—the tendencies which make for sectional and class strife. Intolerance is the mother of tyranny. If America is to remain free, the bigots and fanatics must be curbed by enlightened public opinion. They must not be suffered to discredit and disgrace the country.

The first assault upon the principle of freedom of teaching has ended in failure and fiasco. The fanatics may rave and the galled jade may wince, but the fair-minded Americans are heartily glad that the corporation of Brown University has had the sense and manliness to retreat from an untenable position. In asking President Andrews to withdraw his resignation, it, of course, admitted that its attempt at disciplining the President was a blunder and an impertinence. In its report the corporation assured President Andrews

that it in no way sought to prescribe the path in which he should tread, or to curtail his freedom of opinion and utterance. The original communication, which started the unpleasant agitation, the corporation declared, was intended merely as an intimation that "it would be the part of wisdom" for Dr. Andrews "to take a less active part in exciting partisan discussions" and apply his energies more exclusively to the affairs of the college. This really misstates the facts of the case. There is not the least warrant for the implied charge that President Andrews has taken an "active part in exciting partisan discussion," or that he has failed to devote his energies and attention to the needs of the college. All that has been shown is that once or twice during the national silver campaign he, in private letters to close friends, declared his belief that the best, if not the only, way to bring about international bimetallism is through the United States' initiative in favour of silver. These expressions were made public; but can President Andrews be held responsible for the bitter partisan discussions they excited? Has he no right to express his opinions on a great political and economic issue? Is a president of a great institution to be deprived of freedom of opinion and utterance because there are rabid fanatics in the country who cannot conceive that an honest and intelligent man may entertain free-silver views? Not only have college presidents the right to make their beliefs known, but, as Senator Hoar has admirably said in connection with this very case, it is his duty to the public to indicate his position on the vital questions agitating the country. The public is entitled to know what the educated men of the country think on such questions, and Senator Hoar goes so far as to say that no popular government can exist in the absence of such reasonable liberty of utterance. It would be improper for college presidents to become partisan and "stump" speakers, but the notion that they may not express their opinions on political subjects while important elections are pending is too preposterous to be seriously considered. No one has ever objected to the expression of "gold" views by college presidents of the Eastern States; it is only the temperate and careful endorsement of free coinage that is resented as being calculated to stir up partisan controversy.

Now, the Brown corporation imposes absolutely no restrictive conditions on Dr. Andrews. He is not asked to bind himself to anything or to make any promises. This amounts to a confession that the charges of improper and indiscreet conduct hinted at in the original resolution were absolutely baseless. The corporation professes to have "removed the misapprehension" that Dr. Andrews' "individual views on silver represent those of the corporation and the university," but there is no evidence that any such misapprehension existed anywhere. And what a strange and offensive way the corporation first decided upon to "remove misapprehension"! Removing

apprehension, forsooth, by asking a president to refrain from giving moderate and careful utterance to his own deliberate opinions!

However, it is better to acknowledge error than to persist in it. Enlightened opinion compelled the corporation to recede and reverse itself. It is a pleasure to state that the presidents of the leading American colleges and several distinguished professors of political economy had signed a petition to the corporation declaring that "the future influence of the American universities and the interests of free thought and free speech under a just sense of accountability would be promoted by such action on the part of the corporation as might naturally lead to the withdrawal of the resignation of President Andrews." Among the signees to this petition were President Eliot, of Harvard; President Law, of Columbia; President Adams, of John Hopkins; Professor Sumner, of Yale; and Professor Jewett, of the University of Minnesota. Not one of these distinguished men shares Dr. Andrews' free-silver ideas, it should be added. It is also highly gratifying to state that, in a trenchant letter to the faculty of Brown's University, Mr. Richard Olney, the Secretary of the State Department under Mr. Cleveland, earnestly protested against the resolution disciplining Dr. Andrews on the ground that it implicitly inculcated the doctrine "that an institution of learning should, above all things, get rich, and therefore should square its teachings and limit the utterances of its faculty by the interests and sentiments of those who, for the time being, are the rich men of the community." This doctrine Mr. Olney branded as demoralising and degrading, and he thanked the faculty for its protest against the anti-Andrews resolution.

The reactionists have the effrontery to say that the corporation has yielded in a cowardly manner to the misrepresentations of sentimentalists and "cranks" and pestiferous agitators; but the very intemperance and violence of these bigots will perhaps serve a useful purpose. Americans need to be awakened to the danger of intolerance; and when they see their best and strongest intellectual representatives denounced as weak-minded sentimentalists, and the self-reversal of the Brown corporation ridiculed and sneered at as a disgraceful concession to demagogues, they may appreciate the mental and moral worth of the self-constituted pillars of morality, patriotism, and virtue.

The Brown episode is closed, whether Dr. Andrews remains with the institution or retires. Academic liberty has been vindicated and sustained, but the bigot may return to the attack, and eternal vigilance is still the price of personal and political freedom.

V. S. YARREO.

REFORM OR DISESTABLISHMENT.

CHURCH reform has been talked of for years. The subject is always with us ; but never perhaps has the cry been so coherent as at present ; never have schemes been more numerous or more definitely formulated. Within the last few months nearly every Diocesan Conference in the kingdom has passed some resolution upon the subject. It is now practically certain that the growing demand for Church emancipation will be dealt with at length by the Houses of Convocation at their approaching sessions. Underneath the whole of this agitation is to be traced the guiding hand of a newly formed society, the "Church Reform League." Constituted some two years since as the outcome of deliberations upon the part of a few ardent reformers, the Church Reform League has made the most astonishing progress. Its membership has increased from a few score to nearly a thousand. It has held meetings and conferences without number ; it has bombarded the public Press ; it has captured the Church Congress, and has secured the patronage of many distinguished officials of the Church. The proposals of the League are therefore worthy of attention. The object which the promoters place in the forefront of their programme is the acquirement of self-government for the Church. To phrase the demand for freedom in their own manner, it is desired, "that, saving the supremacy of the Crown according to law, and in respect to legislation subject to the veto of Parliament, the Church have freedom for self-government by means of reformed Houses of Convocation (which shall be thoroughly representative, with power for the Canterbury and York Convocations to sit together if desired), together with a representative body or bodies of the laity." In one form or another this proposal has been adopted by a large number of clerical societies, diocesan conferences, and the like. It is suggested that Parliament should hand over the management of the Church to a central representative body of Churchmen. Proposals emanating from this body are to be placed upon the tables of both Houses of Parliament, and if no petition against them be presented to the Crown they shall, after the expiration of forty days, become law. This suggested reform is, it will be seen at once, of the most far-reaching character. Its great merit is that it is drastic.

Measures dealing with Church reform which have hitherto been before the Legislature, as, for example, Patronage and Benefices Bills, do not go to the root of the matter. They aim not at reforming the Church at all, but at removing certain scandals and abuses in the clerical body. The clergy are not the Church, and the discipline of the clergy is not Church reform. The attitude of the so-called "Church party" in the House of Commons is that of a man with a paint-pot, who smears over a few cracks that begin to loom rather too ominously, instead of repairing the whole fabric. Any attempt at Church reform which is thus restricted, and does not touch the Church as a whole, is in the long run doomed to failure. At the most it can stave off disestablishment for a few years. It may postpone, but will not ultimately avert the threatened separation between Church and State. Now, the proposal of the Church Reform League is worthy of attention, if for no other reason, upon this ground alone, that it deals with the whole Church. Convocation would be raised from the status of an academical debating society and become the legislative body for the Church, subject only to the veto of the Crown. The York and Canterbury Convocations might well be amalgamated into one body, there being no necessity for two Convocations in these days of easy locomotion.

As a corollary to the increased powers of Convocation, other Church bodies, diocesan synods, rural-decantal, and parochial councils would be entrusted with statutory powers, and thus acquire a real importance. To them would be granted the management of many departments of ecclesiastical organisation and administration, such, for example, as a voice in the election of the parish clergyman, and the control of diocesan and parochial finance.

With the increased power thus given to the laity, it seems to be agreed that some form of "godly discipline" would become necessary. The possession of Church rights implies the fulfilment of Church duties. Formerly the clergy exercised discipline over the laity, now, to judge from the Benefices Bill lately before Parliament, the tables are turned, and the laity are desirous of disciplining the clergy. Old forms of penance could not, of course, be revived; but those who lived in flagrant violation of the Church's law, or who neglected their duties as Churchmen, would be deprived of the right of participating by vote in the Councils of the Church, or even, in flagrant cases, of communicating at her altars.

There are those sanguine enough to believe in the possibility of obtaining autonomy of this description for the Church. But the question immediately arises, and it is one to which Parliament would require a definite answer: What is a Churchman? It is an open secret that the League is by no means united upon this point, and that the question of the "Franchise," has been the subject of much debate. A certain section of extremists are desirous of restricting

the vote for all Church Councils, whether parochial or diocesan, to communicants. Canon Gore, for example, has declared himself in favour of a communicant's test, although he would be satisfied if the elector had communicated once during two years. Others, who discern the improbability of Parliament granting self-government to a Church in which tests of this kind were imposed, would prefer to substitute a Church membership roll.

This would be by far the better plan, and more in accordance with the spirit of the times. Every adult, upon signing a Church roll declaring himself to be a *bond-fide* Churchman, would be reckoned a parishioner and entitled to the "Franchise." This course has the advantage of being already known to the law. The Public Worship Regulations Act cannot be put in motion except after a declaration of *bond-fide* churchmanship upon the part of the intending prosecutor.

At present there appears little likelihood of an agreement on this point between the two sections of Church reformers; and unless some definition of the term Churchman can be found acceptable to both parties, it would be useless to ask Parliament to delegate its power to any National Church Synod. Such an *eirenecon* is much to be wished for the acquirement of freedom for the Church is the only alternative to disestablishment worth having. A mere tinkering of the establishment is of little value except as a temporary expedient. Disestablishment and disendowment might, however, be by no means a bad thing for the Church. At present the shackles of the State are too strong. When Parliament was composed of men belonging to one and the same religious body, who had all subscribed to a test of churchmanship, it could with propriety govern the Church. It was, of course, inevitable that those tests should be abolished, but with their abolition it is doubtful if Parliament did not abandon also the only right which it ever had to govern the Church. Its unfitness for this task is fully realised by Parliament, and the greatest difficulty is experienced in obtaining time for Church legislation.

It must, after all, be remembered that the Church is only very partially established or endowed. Beneficed priests and patrons of livings are established, but they are only an infinitesimal portion of the Church. It would puzzle the ordinary baptized layman to state how he was endowed or established. The most that can be said is that he has a claim to the services of the parish priest. The clergy even cannot rightly be said to be established. The postman and the policeman are more established than they, inasmuch as the State, having taking these officials into its service, provides for them during their working life, and finally pensions them off. This is the case of the clergy in some German States. It need hardly be said that there are no established clergy in this sense in England. And even the beneficed clergy who have a freehold are not more than one-half

of the whole number of ordained ministers. The large number of unbeneficed priests are in no way established or endowed. The Church could properly be said to be established had she the right to appoint her own officers; she would be endowed could she dispose of her revenues in her own way. Thus, what is commonly known as disestablishment and disendowment, might, on the contrary, result in a real establishment and endowment of the Church. It is, of course, questionable whether Parliament will ever permit such a measure of freedom without insisting on the severance of the bond between Church and State. The existence of endowments is by no means an unmixed blessing. Endowments tie up the purse-strings of the laity. The Dissenter is aware that if he desires a place of worship after his own heart he must provide for its maintenance. It is otherwise with the Churchman. He is apt to consider that the maintenance of the Church is no affair of his. How the clergy are paid he rarely knows, and he is careful not to inquire. The church he expects to find provided for him. He is pauperised by his ancestors. The chief evil to be feared from disestablishment is other than pecuniary loss. Disestablishment once an accomplished fact, the government of the Church might not improbably fall into the hands of a small clique of extremists. Schisms would probably occur. The wide toleration in ceremonialism and teaching which at present obtains would certainly be curtailed. The sacerdotalist section, being the most persistent, would obtain the upper hand, unless, indeed, there were a revolt of the laity against the pretensions of priestcraft, a thing which in itself is repugnant to the English mind. If an Ecclesiastical National Synod, such as the Church Reform League proposes, were endowed with statutory powers, it would no doubt be able to remove many abuses which are now a hindrance to the work of the Church. With the Church as she at present exists probably no one is satisfied. A legislative Church assembly might, for example, undertake a redistribution of Church revenues. Few reforms are more essential than this. The laity can hardly be expected to contribute to the increase of the incomes of the poor parochial clergy when they see others superabundantly provided for. Until there is some redistribution of ecclesiastical revenues, clergy sustentation funds and similar schemes are doomed to failure. There exist numberless societies for providing doles of money and cast-off clothing for poor clergymen. Other societies take charge of their children when the parents are dead. It is a disgrace to the Church that such organisations are necessary. Without desiring to reduce all to a dead level of uniformity, it must yet be pointed out that a redistribution of ecclesiastical revenues would provide a living wage for the clergy. The average income of benefices, were the funds redistributed, would amount to about £240 per annum. The existence of great prizes is bad for the Church. The newly-ordained deacon

may starve on a pittance for the whole of his life; he may advance to a bishopric and £5000 a year. As long as chances of this kind exist the laity will never subscribe freely to the maintenance of the clergy. Huge feudal palaces such as Farnham and Fulham are quite out of keeping with modern ideas of the functions of a National Church. They should be sold and the money redistributed. The number of bishops might with advantage be doubled and the incomes halved. It is fruitless to argue that the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London spend the whole of their episcopal incomes on the expenses of their respective sees. With the continuous growth of the democratic idea, no Church presenting anomalies like these can possibly be brought to appeal to the working man. Disproportionate remuneration for doing the same work is contrary to his sense of justice.

Another direction in which reform is urgently needed is in the matter of patronage. In methods of preferment there is no institution in which injustice is so rampant as in the Church. Men of age and experience find themselves again and again passed over in favour of some recruit of only three or four years' standing in his profession. Such appointments are frequently due to political or private influence, which is exercised in a way that would not be tolerated in any other department of the State. When a particularly flagrant case occurs it is left to a few poor curates to utter a protest; the lips of highly placed officials are always sealed. It is frequently urged by way of justification that the interests of the particular parish must be the first consideration. It is forgotten that an appointment which outrages the sense of justice in the whole Church cannot possibly be for the welfare of a particular parish. Sometimes, again, a young man is preferred because he has large private means, and it is understood that he will spend his income freely in the parish. It is disastrous that preferment to the cure of souls should be made to depend upon the possession of private means. Yet there does not appear to be any disposition on the part of those in authority to alter the existing state of things. It may be asked, What is to be done? A board of patronage might with advantage be formed in every diocese. Upon this board representatives from the parish to which an appointment was to be made should sit in such sufficient numbers as to have a real voice in the nomination of the parish clergyman. Such a method of conducting an appointment would be merely to revert to primitive custom. The seven deacons were elected; the choice of Matthias was virtually by election. Private patronage should be abolished. At present one-sixth of the total number of livings are constantly changing hands for 'pecuniary' considerations. The purchase of advowsons and next presentations should be made illegal. The diocesan board might be excepted from this rule, and be permitted to purchase advowsons at a fair valuation. Many.

patrons of the more conscientious sort would probably gladly part with their right of presentation to a diocesan board even without compensation. Where compensation was demanded, the money to purchase should be forthcoming from the laity of the diocese without difficulty.

Closely connected with the question of appointments is the problem of the retirement of the clergy. It is desirable that a compulsory retiring limit be fixed for all clergymen alike. This is the rule in all departments of the Civil Service, but in the case of the clergy the age for retirement might be placed rather higher than the usual limit of sixty-five—say sixty-eight or seventy.

The Benefices Bill lately before the House of Commons had one grave defect; it provided for the compulsory retirement of incumbents when incapacitated from work, but nothing was said about the retirement of bishops and cathedral dignitaries; whilst it is sometimes forgotten that assistant curates are compulsorily retired at the age of forty through lack of employment. A compulsory retiring age for all clergy alike, coupled with the institution of a pension fund, is a greatly needed reform. It is not suggested that a clergyman past the retiring limit of age should give up all clerical work. Whilst relinquishing his official position, he would, if still sufficiently vigorous, find abundant opportunities for useful service as a kind of diocesan free lance.

It may of course be urged that the difficulties in the way of reforms of this far-reaching character are almost insuperable. The chief obstacle lies probably in the apathy and ignorance of the average educated layman, who has no conception of the function and authority of the Church in her corporate capacity. A conviction nevertheless is gaining ground that methods and machinery in use at present are cumbersome and out-of-date. The mockery of election to a bishopric, the farce of the *congé d'elire* with the recent object lessons at Bow Church combine to demonstrate even to the most apathetic the necessity for reform.

Thus far, attention has been directed to reforms for which an Act or Acts of Parliament would be required. Other reforms, however, could be initiated without any legislative enactments. The question of the unbeneficed clergy is one of these. The continuous increase in the numbers of the unbeneficed clergy is a source of great danger to the Church, the magnitude of which seems hardly realised by the authorities. There is, moreover, a growing discontent in their ranks. Assistant curates for many years have been multiplying three times as rapidly as benefices. A curate who through no fault of his own remains unbeneficed after the age of forty, finds it exceedingly difficult to obtain employment, or is obliged to accept a lower rate of remuneration with every succeeding year. The settled policy of the bishops has resulted in degrading the unbeneficed priest to the

position of a mere employé of an incumbent. This is contrary to the original intention of the State or the Church. The Church in her Prayer-book knows no distinction between priests. The State has provided that the curate shall have the right of appeal to the bishop against arbitrary dismissal upon the part of the incumbent. This appeal, intended as a protection to the curate, has been rendered nugatory by the action of the bishops, who have very rarely been known to refuse the necessary permission to dismiss the assistant curate. Frequently bishops will ordain and license a deacon to a curacy from which an experienced priest has been dismissed for no adequate reason. Thus, practically, incumbents determine the number of clerical recruits. The curate once deprived of his cure has no redress. He cannot, like an employé in any other sphere, start upon clerical business for himself. The present plan, by which the bishops ordain a and sundry who can find a title, is most disastrous, and results in depriving many experienced priests of their title to work and maintenance in the fold of the Church. The number of clergy ordained should be regulated to meet existing needs. Titles should be expected to last for three or four years, instead of two, as customary at present. When it becomes desirable that a curate should quit his post he should be moved to some suitable sphere by the bishop, not left to tout for another curacy through the medium of advertisements in the clerical papers. These, and other disabilities which fall to the lot of the unbeneficed clergy, the bishops could remedy if they chose without Act of Parliament. Unfortunately, they show little disposition to initiate reforms even when these are comparatively near to hand. The stipend of assistant curates should be paid from a central diocesan fund, upon a scale graduated according to length of service, not left, as at present, to be scraped together from a variety of sources. The multiplicity of associations engaged in doing the same work leads to unnecessary office expenditure, but no strenuous effort is made to amalgamate these various organisations into a few diocesan funds. The unbeneficed clergy should be admitted to a vote for Convocation and more generally represented in the councils of the Church. This is a reform which has been approved again and again by Convocation and other Church bodies, but no Archdeacon has as yet been found courageous enough to summon assistant curates to record their votes.

Disestablishment, if it came, would undoubtedly be the means of infusing fresh life into the Church. The laity would acquire additional interest in the discharge of their duties as Churchmen, and might reasonably be expected to claim and exercise their Church privileges.

Churchmen will no longer submit to be legislated for by the Church party in the House of Commons, aided by the advice of a few bishops. They desire to legislate for themselves. The question

now coming to the front is whether it be possible to secure this reform without disestablishment. The present attempt on the part of the Church Reform League to obtain freedom for the Church is an interesting development in this direction. With self-government the Church might be trusted to reform herself. If, however, it become evident with lapse of time that this demand is one which the State will not grant except at the price of endowments, then Churchmen must press for disestablishment.

A. G. B. ATKINSON.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS: AT HOME AND ABROAD.

THE recent proposal of the Transvaal legislature to raise the salaries of its members to the hitherto unequalled figure of £1200 a year has revived in this country interest in the whole question of Parliamentary payment. Four years ago, for the first time since the old English practice of allowing wages to the members of the House of Commons ceased, the principle was adopted by that body, and, although under the present Unionist Government the question is likely to slumber, in spite of Mr. Chamberlain's former advocacy of it at Birmingham¹ in his "Radical days," the next Radical Ministry will probably have to deal with it, if its Labour friends have sufficient influence to make its demands heard. But this is a subject upon which we have a large amount of experience to guide us, and it is therefore desirable, before coming to any conclusion, to see how payment of members has fared elsewhere.

As the result of a careful examination, it has been found that of the self-governing British Colonies, one alone, and that the youngest, Western Australia, has not adopted payment of members, for Natal is really no exception, as will be seen below; while in Europe the German *Reichstag*, the Italian Parliament, and the legislatures of Spain and Portugal alone follow the British plan of voluntary public service. Moreover, as the German, Italian, and Portuguese legislators enjoy the privilege of free travelling, Spain is the only European country which exactly reproduces the practice of Westminster. It is therefore true, as Sir Charles Dilke once pointed out, that we are almost unique in this respect. But, then, we have a leisured class, such as hardly exists to the same extent in any other country. Still, my own conviction is that, though Radical capitalists will do all they can to stave off a change which will enable Radical "stalwarts" to dispense with their services, the change will come sooner or later. Meanwhile, it is well to consider the practice of other countries as well as that of our own Colonies, and, although personally opposed to payment of members, I have accordingly endeavoured to describe the history of the movement at home and its progress abroad without bias or exaggeration.

In England the practice of paying members of Parliament existed

for nearly four hundred years, from the end of the thirteenth to the close of the seventeenth century. Henry¹ states that while Peers always attended at their own expense, the custom of paying the Commons "commenced with the commencement of representation." The best opinion is that this system of payment was introduced into England by statute, as was the case in Scotland by a statute of 1427, but that the English statute was lost. However that may be, the fact remains that in the reign of Henry VIII. the wages of members were secured by legislation. The rate of remuneration for knights of the shire was always higher than that for burgesses and citizens, though the precise amounts varied at different times. Thus in 1296, the earliest date at which the subject is mentioned, the members for London received 10s. a day by a vote of the magistrates, two years later they received 100s. each, and in the reign of Edward II. the rate was fixed by usage or ordinance at 4s. a day for knights and 2s. a day for burgesses and citizens. This continued to be the usual scale of payment henceforth; but we find many exceptions to this general rule, the towns represented being at liberty to increase their payments if they pleased. Thus in 1431 the members for Lynn had 6s. 8d. and in 1442 only 2s.; in 1483 the members for York had eight extra days' wages on account of Edward V.'s coronation, while we read of 5s., 10s. and even 13s. 4d. a day as the pay of the Newcastle representatives at various times. Every member, and not merely those who needed pecuniary assistance, received this payment, and it was permissible to sue for the money as a matter of right. The case of Thomas King, member for Harwich in the latter years of Charles II., and the decision of Lord Chancellor Nottingham on the point, prove that this claim by writ *de levandis expensis* was strictly enforceable at law even towards the end of the seventeenth century, and Lord Campbell was of opinion that it would still be valid.² Andrew Marvell has been stated by Hallam to have been one of the last members of Parliament who received pay for his services. But there are cases in the Newcastle records as late as 1685, and in some Cornish boroughs wages seem to have been paid as late as the eighteenth century. But before then the system had become practically obsolete and has never been re-introduced. It may be pointed out that, when it was in force, those who did not attend a single sitting during the Parliamentary session forfeited their claims to payment, and the attendance³ of members was strictly regulated by Acts of 1541, 1580 (which imposed a fine) and 1626.

Although the worthy Pepys, dining in the City on March 30, 1668, and discussing the decline of public morals with his friends after dinner, reports that "all concluded that the bane of Parlia-

¹ *Great Britain*, x. 68. Cf. Stubbs's *Constitutional History of England*, III. 459-460, 523-524.

² *Lives of the Lord Chancellors*, vol. III.

³ Quoted in *Hansard*, cc. 1840.

ment had been the leaving off the old custom of the places allowing wages to those that served them in Parliament," there was no attempt to revive the practice till nearly a century after its final disuse. In 1780 an election committee of Westminster electors, of which Charles James Fox was chairman, recommended payment of members, and the Society for Constitutional Information, of which the Duke of Richmond was president, adopted this recommendation. But the French Revolution and the long reaction which followed it stopped all democratic movements, and we hear no more of the question until the Marquis of Blandford¹ introduced his abortive Bill in the Parliament of 1830. Seven years later payment of members formed one of the six "points" of the People's Charter, which claimed "that every member of the House of Commons be entitled at the close of the session to a writ of expenses on the Treasury for his legislative duties in the public service, and shall be paid £500 *per annum*." In 1842 the short-lived Metropolitan Parliamentary Reform Association, which comprised among its members such men as Roebuck, Joseph Hume, Milner Gibson, Lord Radnor, and the late Mr. P. A. Taylor, had as one of its objects "that each representative of the people should be paid for his services." It was not till 1870 that Mr. P. A. Taylor actually raised the question on a motion in the House of Commons during the first administration of Mr. Gladstone. The then Prime Minister, who was subsequently induced to sanction the principle in the "Newcastle Programme" of 1891, strongly opposed Mr. Taylor's motion, which was defeated by 211 votes against 24. The whole debate on that occasion, which took place on April 5, is well worth reading, and contains a vast amount of information on the subject.² We next hear of payment of members in the "Radical Programme" of 1885, and a Bill dealing with the question was introduced by Mr. Spensley in the following year, but quietly dropped. Mr. Fenwick now took the matter up with considerable assiduity. His first motion³ for payment of members, on July 6, 1888, was defeated by 192 to 135; his second,⁴ on March 29, 1889, attracted so little interest that the House was counted out. Two years later he introduced a Bill, which was read a first time and subsequently discharged; and finally,⁵ on March 25, 1892, another motion of the same honourable member was beaten by 227 to 162. In the new Parliament with a small Radical majority, the question was more fortunate. On March 24, 1893, on the motion of Mr. W. Allen,⁶ a majority of 47 was recorded in favour of the principle, and the same member carried it on March 22, 1895, by 18 votes. But, in spite of the pressure of the Radicals below the gangway, neither Mr. Gladstone nor Lord Rosebery⁷ took any steps to carry

¹ *Hansard*, second series, xlii. 689.

² *Hansard*, cc. 1384.

³ *Ibid.* cccxxviii. 681.

⁴ *Ibid.* cccxxiv. 1180.

⁵ *Parliamentary Debates*, ii. 1885.

⁶ *Ibid.* fourth series, x. 1086; xxxi. 1749.

⁷ Reply to Parliamentary Committee of Trades Union Congress, November 20, 1894.

this resolution into law. The suggestion that provision should be made in the Budget for members' salaries met with no favour from the Chancellor of the Exchequer, while Mr. Gladstone's proposal for giving payment to those members alone who actually required pecuniary assistance pleased no one and was indignantly criticised as likely to form two classes of members. Since then the question, though still discussed at the annual meetings of the Trades Union Congress, has dropped, temporarily at any rate, out of the sphere of practical politics. It may be added that payment of members was proposed in the Manx legislature on November 15, 1893, but was rejected, only three members of the House of Keys voting for it.¹

In the Colonies, however, the fate of this measure has been very different. Among the Australian colonies Victoria set the lead. A Bill, thrice rejected by the Upper House, was at last passed in 1870, after an agitation which had lasted for nine years and had led to a conflict between the two branches of the legislature. This Act was renewed in 1874 and is said to have been a success; money scandals have been absent from the Victoria Parliament since its introduction.² According to the Constitution Act Amendment Act of 1890, members of the Legislative Assembly were paid £300 a year,³ while members of the Legislative Council are not paid at all. The latter, however, no less than the former, are entitled to free passes over the Victorian lines, and may travel free between Melbourne and their residences or constituencies by mail coaches or boats. But during the financial year, ending with the first half of 1893, the salaries of Victorian legislators were temporarily reduced to £285 by virtue of an Act for effecting retrenchments in official emoluments. This sum has since been reduced to £240 *per annum*.

The example of Victoria was not followed by any other Australian colony till 1886, when Queensland, after the Legislative Council had rejected similar proposals in the two previous years, adopted the plan of paying at the rate of two guineas a day while Parliament was actually sitting. In 1889 the fixed salary of £300 a year was substituted for this daily wage, and three years later the annual sum was reduced to £150 for members of the Legislative Assembly, those of the Legislative Council not being paid. But no member in receipt of an official salary was allowed to receive payment under this Act up to the amount of that salary. A free pass on all the Queensland lines during their period of membership was given to members of both Houses, and travelling expenses were allowed at the rate of 1s. 6d. a mile, after the first three miles, from the member's residence to the nearest seaport or railway station, as well

¹ *Times*, November 16, 1893.

² *Baden's History of Australia*, iii, 370, 380 *et seq.*; Sir C. Dilke, *Problems of Greater Britain*, i, 184, 200-201, 228.

³ Parliamentary paper on *Payment of Members*, issued by the Colonial Office, August 1893.

as the actual cost of passage by sea to and fro between the seaport and the meeting-place of Parliament. These allowances were payable for only one journey to and fro each session, except in case of an adjournment extending over thirty days. Next year a proposal was made for the restoration of the old rate of payment, but was strongly opposed by Sir Samuel Griffith, on the ground that so many professional politicians had sprung up in the colony. In spite of this warning, the old rate of £300 has now been adopted.¹

South Australia for three years underwent² the usual struggle in order to obtain the assent of its Legislative Council to payment of members. At last, in 1887, an Act was passed which endowed "every member of Parliament, whether a member of the Legislative Council or of the House of Assembly," with a salary of £200 a year, no member in receipt of any official salary of more than that amount being entitled to this payment. Fares by mail, steamboat, or other public conveyance, incurred by members while travelling between the House and either their residences or their constituencies while Parliament is in session, may be repaid. These arrangements still remain in force.

New South Wales was without salaried legislators till 1889, and up to that date her Parliament was so bad,³ that its example was quoted as an argument in favour of payment of members. But that was not the opinion of Sir H. Parkes, who opposed the Parliamentary Allowances Bill of 1889 on principle, though he subsequently supported it, when amended by Council, on the technical ground that the Council had no right to amend a Money Bill. The Bill passed into law, and allowed members of the Legislative Assembly £300 a year each, that sum being charged on the Consolidated Fund and payable monthly, unless they were in receipt of salary or pension from the public service. The Legislative Council, as usual, remained unsalaried, but members of either House had already been awarded free passes on the New South Wales lines by the Government Railways Act of 1888, and this free pass was extended to the lines of all the other Australian colonies. The thirteen members of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Public Works, the estimated cost of which exceeds £20,000, were⁴ also given fees at the rate of four guineas a sitting for the chairman, and three for the members, as well as travelling expenses at the rate of 30s. a day, in addition to the free passes, while inquiring into public works outside the boundary of the county of Cumberland. Further, all members of Parliamentary Select Committees received travelling expenses when necessary. In spite of a forcible speech by Sir G. Dibbs, at Penrith, three or four years ago, in favour of the repeal of this Act, it still remains the law.

¹ Dilke, *Problems of Greater Britain*, i. 371; ii. 280. *Echo*, November 22, 1893.

² Dilke, *ibid.*, i. 389. ³ Dilke, *ibid.*, i. 284-286.

Western Australia, the last of the colonies on the Australian continent to obtain self-government, is the one Australian exception to payment of members. There no such allowance exists, but members are allowed to travel free on all Government lines—a privilege which is extended by courtesy to private railways.

New Zealand first introduced the system of payment in 1884, and three years later a curious plan was approved, by which members of the Legislative Council were paid £100 a session if they resided more than three miles away, and nothing if they resided within the three-mile radius. Similarly, members of the House of Representatives received £150 a session if they lived outside this area, and £125 if they lived within it. The total number of members was reduced in consequence of the salaried system. This arrangement of payment by residence was abolished by the Act of 1892, which is still in force and provides out of the Consolidated Fund for the monthly payment of a salary to each member of either the Legislative Council or the House of Representatives, at the rate of £150 a year for the former and £240 for the latter. But members who fail to attend are fined £2 a day, five days of grace being allowed, unless they can show good cause for their absence. Those in receipt of official salaries are not paid salaries as members, and it is provided that no member's remuneration is attachable for debt during the session. Coach-fares, sea-passages, and reasonable travelling expenses for one journey to and from the place of meeting are allowed. Tasmania, which introduced payment of both her Legislative Council and her House of Assembly in 1890, began by awarding every member out of the Consolidated Fund £100 *per annum* in two sums of £50, the first payable as soon as the member had attended twenty sittings, the second payable at the end of the session. In 1893, however, this amount was reduced to £75, paid as above in two equal sums, and a further reduction to £50 a year had since been made. No member in receipt of an official salary of that amount is entitled to receive wages as a deputy. There are in this colony the usual free passes on the railways, and the member for each district may travel free by any conveyance running under contract in his district in connection with the mails. A peculiarity of the Tasmanian system is the adoption of the long obsolete English practice of free postage for legislators. During the session, and also out of the session, provided that the member declares his communication to be "on public service only," a Tasmanian law-maker may frank his letters and, within the limits of the colony, telegraph free of charge.

Passing from Australasia to South Africa, we find that the Cape Parliament¹ established the system of payment, alike for the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly, by an Act of 1888. An

¹ Dilke, *Problems of Greater Britain*, II. 255-257.

arrangement, similar to that in force in New Zealand, was made here, and a distinction was drawn between those who resided not more than fifteen miles away and those who lived beyond that distance. A member of the former class receives one guinea a day of any session upon which he actually attends the House; while a member of the latter class is given an extra fifteen shillings as "subsistence allowance." But these salaries are not payable for more than ninety days in all for any single session, so as not to cause the undue extension of Parliamentary proceedings. Moreover, Ministers, the Speaker, and the President of the Legislative Council are not paid the usual members' salaries; but all members receive remuneration for their services on Commissions. No travelling allowance is given to members residing within the fifteen-mile radius, but those outside may claim a shilling a mile, calculated by the most direct route from their residences to the nearest railway station or seaport, and a free first-class ticket thence on to the House, available for going and returning once a session. Claimants for these privileges must sign one or other of the two schedules provided in the Act.¹

Natal has altered its practice in this respect since the reform of its constitution in 1893. In that colony the present custom is that members of the Legislative Assembly should not be paid, but those who reside more than two miles from the seat of Government receive a travelling allowance of £1 a day. Prior to the Act of that year all non-official elective members of the Legislative Council who lived three miles off were allowed £1 a day, and all elective members, wherever resident, had free passes over the lines, not only of their own colony, but of the Cape, the Orange Free State, and the Transvaal.

Turning to North America, we can cite Newfoundland as another instance of a colony which allows its members of Parliament the privilege of franking their letters during the session. Here the rate of payment is \$120 a session for members of the Legislative Council and \$200 or \$300 a session for members of the House of Assembly, according as they do or do not reside in the capital. Any one who takes part in the work of the session, even for a single day, may claim his salary. But Newfoundland makes no allowance for travelling expenses. The new Ministry proposes to abolish the salaries of the Legislative Council as an economy.²

In Canada³ the practice has existed for more than a decade. By the Act of 1886, as amended in 1889, every member of either the Dominion Senate or the House of Commons is paid out of the Consolidated Fund \$10 a day if the session be not more than thirty days, or a sum of \$1000 if it last longer. This sum is not, however, paid in a lump, but at the rate of \$7 a day and the balance at the

¹ See Parliamentary Report above quoted, p. 9.

² See Munro, *Constitution of Canada*, pp. 53, 54.

³ *Times*, Nov. 9, 1897.

end of the session. For every day's absence a member forfeits \$8, unless the absence is due to illness. Travelling expenses are reckoned at ten cents a mile of the distance, by the nearest route, between the member's residence and the place of meeting.

In all the provinces which form the Dominion of Canada payment of members prevails. In Quebec both Houses receive salaries at the rate of six piastres a day, if the session be not more than thirty days, or a sum of 800 piastres if it last longer. Here also the travelling allowance is at the rate of ten centimes a mile. In Ontario, each member of the Legislative Assembly is paid out of the Consolidated Fund \$6 a day, if the session terminate within thirty days, and \$600, at the rate of \$4 a day, and the balance at the end of any session prolonged beyond that period. A sum of \$4 a day is deducted for non-attendance. No free passes are granted, but mileage at the rate of ten cents a mile by the nearest mail route may be claimed for one journey either way between the member's abode and the place of meeting. In Manitoba, every member of the Legislative Assembly is entitled to this rate of payment for travelling expenses, and to \$600 for each complete session. In New Brunswick the same rule with regard to travelling expenses applies, and the sessional salary of members of the Legislative Assembly is \$300. In Prince Edward Island the rate of travelling expenses is fixed at eleven cents a mile, and the sessional allowance to each member of the legislature at \$160, in addition to \$12 for postage and stationery, paid out of the annual sum voted for the contingent expenses of that body. In British Columbia, by the Constitution Act each member of the Legislative Assembly has a sessional allowance of \$600, subject to a deduction of \$6 a day for non-attendance. Mileage is allowed on the usual Canadian system, but the rate is twenty-five cents a mile. There are no free passes on the railways. In Nova Scotia there is, indeed, no statutory payment of members, but by a long-established custom a sum, at present fixed at \$500, is voted in the estimates to each member of the two Houses. Here, too, there are no free passes, but travelling expenses at the rate of fifteen cents a mile from the member's house to the capital and back are remitted. Finally, in the North-West Territories, each member of the Legislative Assembly receives \$500 a session, and hotel expenses from the member's house to Regina and back are paid.

We shall find that payment of members is almost as common in foreign countries as in our own Colonies. In Austria, the *Abgeordnetenhaus*, or Lower House, is paid at the rate of ten florins a day during the session, as well as travelling expenses in proportion to the distance of the members' houses. In Hungary the scale of remuneration for members of the Lower House is 2400 florins a year, and 800 florins for house-rent. The Hungarian Minister of

Commerce also issues to deputies cheap season tickets between the capital and their homes and constituencies, and gives them certificates, enabling them to travel over all the State lines in Hungary one class higher than their ordinary tickets. It may be remarked that there was a large amount of scandal in the spring of 1893 in consequence of the assignment of their salaries by Hungarian deputies who had run into debt.

Belgium has had payment of members as long as it has existed as an independent State, for the 52nd Article of the Constitution provides that: "*Chaque membre de la Chambre des Représentants jouit d'une indemnité mensuelle de 200 florins pendant toute la durée de la session. Ceux qui habitent la ville où se tient la session ne jouissent d'aucune indemnité.*"¹ This arrangement was in force till 1893, when each deputy was granted an annual indemnity of 4000 francs and a free pass over the Government railways between his home and the place of session.

In Bulgaria, each metropolitan member of the *Sobranje* or any member who has his domicile in Sofia, or in any other city where the *Sobranje* may sit, receives fifteen francs a day while the session lasts. All other deputies receive twenty francs a day and an allowance, calculated at the rate of sixty centimes a kilometre, for their journey to and from the *Sobranje*. But if it be possible to perform this journey by rail or steam the price of a first-class ticket is allowed instead of this latter sum. The Presidents and Vice-Presidents have also sessional allowances of 3000 francs and 1500 francs respectively for entertainments and other official expenses, and the President has the further "right of travelling for the whole year, first-class, gratis, on all lines belonging to the State, a free pass on all steamers, as well as the right of free communication by telegraph with all Government authorities and with every deputy on matters of public service."²

Danish politicians possess a unique privilege in the fact that every member of the *Landsting* or the *Folkething* is entitled to a free seat in the Royal theatre—a strange counter-attraction, one would have thought, to the dreary debates of Parliament. By the Electoral Law of 1867, which is still in force, the salary of members of either Chamber is fixed at three rixdalers (6s. 8d.) a day during the session, this salary being compulsory. Members receive their actual travelling expenses to and from the capital to their residences on presentation of an account approved and attested by the President of the Chamber in which they sit.

In France every senator or deputy receives 9000 francs a year, less a sum—Sir Wilfrid Lawson will note with horror—of five

¹ Reports from H.M. Diplomatic Representatives abroad respecting the Payment of Members. Miscellaneous, No. 2. 1898.

² Mr. Dering to Foreign Office, March 22, 1893:

francs a month for the *buvette*. M. Jaurès, the Socialist leader, has recently tried in vain to abolish the senators' salaries. Members of both Houses travel first-class on all State lines free of charge, and may enjoy the same privilege on other railways by paying a monthly subscription of ten francs. It may be mentioned that the representatives of the French colonies are not only paid in the same way as their fellow-legislators, out of the national funds, but are also remunerated by their respective colonies "at very varying rates" in their capacity of colonial representatives on the *Conseil supérieur des Colonies*.¹

In spite of frequent attempts to secure payment of members of the German *Reichstag*, that body still remains unsalaried, according to Article 32 of the German Constitution, but the deputies are granted free passes on the railways. The practice of the various State legislatures differs, however, from that of the Imperial Parliament. Thus, in Prussia, while members of the Upper House, of *Herrenhaus*, have no other pecuniary privilege than that of free railway passes over the Prussian lines, the members of the *Abgeordnetenhaus*, or Lower House, are paid fifteen marks a day during the session besides travelling expenses, and cannot refuse either allowance. The latter is calculated on the basis of thirteen pfennige a kilometre for journeys, by rail or boat, with three marks extra for each arrival and departure, and sixty pfennige a kilometre for all other journeys. In Bavaria, the Upper House and those members of the Lower House who reside in Munich are unpaid, the others receiving ten marks a day during the session and for the day before and the day after Parliament meets. But this allowance is suspended during the absence of the deputies from their parliamentary duties. As regards travelling expenses, a free passage over the Bavarian State lines is granted to all deputies during the session and for the eight days preceding and following it. They have also an allowance of fifty pfennige a kilometre between their residence and Munich on all non-State lines in Bavaria at the beginning and end of each session. Württemberg, the most democratic of the German States, instituted payment of members as far back as 1821. The present rule there is that members of the Upper House receive salaries and journey-money only on application; but both Houses are entitled to nine marks forty-three pfennige for each member for every day during the session that he is present. The journey-money is calculated for railways at twice the amount of a second-class fare, for diligences at twice the cost of one seat, and for other forms of conveyance at one mark seventy-one pfennige a *Poststunde*. Members non-resident in Stuttgart can have, if they prefer it, free passes by any class between their homes and the capital during the sittings and committees of the Legislature and for two days before

¹ Dilke, *Problems of Greater Britain*, ii. 257.

and after. The twelve members of the permanent legislative committee, which sits during the recess, are also paid.¹ In Saxony, the members of both Houses, with the exception of the hereditary and certain of the *ex officio* members of the Upper House, are paid at the rate of twelve marks a day during the session, except when absent without leave; they have free first-class tickets over the railways of the kingdom while Parliament is sitting. Those members of both Chambers in Baden whose seats are not hereditary are paid at the same rate as in Saxony, and are reimbursed the cost of their journeys at the opening and prorogation of the Legislature. In Hesse, an exception is made in the case of those who reside more than two miles from the Parliament House, as well as in that of the hereditary legislators; but all others receive nine marks a day so long as the session lasts, "to meet the expenses of their residence in the capital and the cost of their journeys to and from it."² In the duchy of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, members while attending the sittings are paid six marks a day if resident at Coburg or Gotha, and ten marks a day if living elsewhere. The latter are allowed three marks over second-class fares for incidental expenses if near a railway, or one mark a mile if obliged to drive.

Greece, in spite of the opinion of the late M. Tricoupis, who would have preferred if possible the present English system, has payment of members, and the institution has there, at any rate, helped to increase the breed of professional politicians. There, as in New Zealand, the number of deputies was reduced when salaries were first introduced; but the size of the *Boulé* has since then been augmented. The present arrangement, as I was informed when lately in Athens, is that each deputy receives 1800 paper drachmae, worth about £43 at the present rate of exchange, for every session; but those who are in receipt of civil or military pay are entitled to no more than the difference between that pay and £43. There are no free passes or travelling allowances. But, if there be an extraordinary session, the deputies are paid the cost of travelling to and from the capital, and have an allowance for such extraordinary session, varying from 500 to 1800 paper drachmae, and usually about 1000 paper drachmae.

In Holland, where payment of members has existed since 1848, the rule is that those who belong to the first Chamber of the States-General receive 10 gulden (16s. 8d.) a day during the session, and the same salary during their attendance at committees in the recess. But this rule applies only to those members who do not reside at The Hague. Every member of the second, or lower, Chamber, wherever resident, receives 2000 gulden (£167) a year, unless he either becomes a Minister or is absent the whole session. Members of either Chamber, if not living at The Hague, are entitled on making a declaration to

¹ See Parliamentary Report quoted above, p. 4.

² *Ibid.*, p. 10.

travelling expenses once a session in the shape of a first-class fare by the shortest route, with an allowance for luggage.

Italy resembles Great Britain, in that neither the Italian senators nor the Italian deputies are paid. Both have, however, the right of travelling by rail or steamer gratis.

In Luxemburg, the Chamber of Deputies is paid at the rate of five francs a day during the session. But members living in the capital are not paid.¹ There are no other pecuniary privileges such as free passes on the railways.

Portugal affords a rare instance of a country which has practically abolished payment of members in order to reduce expenditure. By a Royal decree of September 15, 1892, payment ceased, except in the case of the six colonial representatives. But the local municipalities in the various constituencies may pay a subsidy of not more than \$3, 333 reis (14s. 10d.) a day to any deputy, non-resident in Lisbon, who really requires it. All deputies are still allowed a free passage by any Government vessel and over all State railways in the discharge of their official duties.

Members of either House in Roumania² receive 25 lei (£1) a day during the session, when actually present. In cases of absence through illness, not exceeding fifteen days, they can draw their pay. They are entitled to free passes on all Roumanian lines and to travelling expenses where posting is necessary.

In Servia,³ members of the *Skupschina* are paid out of the State funds 10 dinars (10 francs) a day during the session; but members who live on the spot, or are State officials or pensioners, receive only half this sum, and all those who are absent from the daily roll-call forfeit their allowance. Non-resident members are entitled to travelling expenses at 3 dinars an hour.

Spain is the only European country, except our own, which allows its legislators no remuneration of any kind.

The upper Chamber of the Swedish *Riksdag* is unpaid and has no privileges for travelling. But each member of the lower House receives 1200 kronor (£66 13s.) for every ordinary session, which usually lasts four months. A fine of 10 kronor a day, seldom enforced in practice, exists in case of absence without leave. The cost of a journey first-class to and from Stockholm, with luggage, at the beginning and end of the session is allowed. During an extra session, members of the lower House are paid 10 kronor a day and have the above allowance for travelling expenses. In Norway, payment of members has reached its *reductio ad absurdum*. The members of either Chamber of the *Storting*

¹ M. Ruppert, clerk of the Luxemburg Chamber of Deputies, courteously informs me that this rule is enforced by Art. 75 of the Constitution, and that a further Act, passed in 1879, deprives a member of his seat if he has been absent for more than half the sittings of two consecutive sessions.

² Law of December 9, 1884.

³ Clause 95 of law of March 25, 1890.

receive 12 kronor (13s. 4d.) a day during the session, with the natural result that the sessions grow longer and longer. A remarkable article in the *Morgenblad* for March 26, 1893, pointed out that, owing to this extension of political work, men of business cannot spare the time for a Parliamentary career, and have to give way to professional politicians. The journal even stated that "members of committees have to seek for aid outside the *Storting*, because they either do not possess the necessary knowledge or cannot find time to do the work themselves." In April 1893 no fewer than five motions for limiting payment to a fixed number of days, or the substitution for daily payment of a fixed sessional allowance, were all defeated. But this is not the only abuse of the Norwegian system. Members are entitled to an allowance for "nursing and medical treatment" during the session or on the way to or from Parliament. This allowance has been interpreted by deputies to include such luxuries as baths, gymnastics, massage, dental operations, and even "wine for the sick"; though, it is only fair to add, there has been an improvement during the last ten years. The cost of a member's burial is also paid by the State. Travelling expenses are estimated at 10 kronor (11s. 1d.) a day to and from the *Storting*, and an allowance of so much per kilometre for the actual fares.

Members of either Chamber of the Swiss Federal legislature are paid at the rate of 20 francs a day, if they have answered the daily roll-call, and 20 centimes a kilometre for the journey from their residences to the capital and back once a session. These sums are paid by the Federal Government, in the case of the National Council by the cantons in that of the State Council.

Japan introduced payment of members by the Constitution of 1889, so that both the elected and nominated members of the Upper House, and all members of the House of Representatives are compelled to receive 800 yen (about £133 6s. 8d.) and travelling expenses. The result has not been satisfactory, for at the first general election to the Japanese Parliament the creditors of honourable members who had run into debt were ready to move heaven and earth to secure the return of their debtors, as the only means of securing their money.

The Egyptian Legislative Council is divided, in respect of payment, into two classes—the first-class, members resident in Cairo, who receive £90 a year for carriage expenses; and the second, provincial members, who are paid £250 a year for the cost of living in Cairo and a fixed sum for their travelling expenses once a month between their homes and that city. Whenever the General Assembly is convoked, its members are awarded their railway expenses, together with an allowance for eight days' residence in Cairo at £1 a day.

The *Volksraad* of the Orange Free State is paid at the rate of £2 a day per member. In the Transvaal the scale of remuneration used

to be fixed at 30s. a day, until one worthy member declared in his place that "he had to swim a river in order to attend the session, and he was not going to drown himself in his old age" for that sum. The rate was then raised, until in the present year¹ it has been proposed to fix it at £1200 a year, the highest salary paid by any legislature in the world.

In the United States payment of members is of much greater antiquity than elsewhere. The American Constitution provided that "the senators and representatives shall receive a compensation for their services, to be ascertained by law, and paid out of the Treasury of the United States." The first Act of Congress on this subject, passed in 1789, provided that each member should receive \$6 for each day's attendance in his respective House, and that this allowance should be continued when he was absent through sickness. Mileage "at the rate of \$6 for every twenty miles of the estimated distance by the most usual road from his place of residence to the seat of Congress" was allowed to each member at the beginning and end of every session. This Act, renewed in 1796, remained in force till 1816, when the principle was changed, and an annual payment of \$1500, less deductions in case of absence, was substituted in place of the daily payment. But two years later the former system was restored, the rate, however, being raised to \$8 a day, and the mileage increased to \$8 for every twenty miles. This Act gave such satisfaction that no change was made till 1856, when a lump sum of \$3000 a year, less deductions in case of absence caused by any other reason than family affliction, was agreed upon. Ten years later this sum was raised to \$5000, and mileage fixed at \$20 a mile. With the exception of a brief interval in 1873, when the high figure of \$7500 was granted, this rate of remuneration has been in force ever since. The salary is paid monthly, and the mileage reckoned by the nearest route. The distance has to be certified, and an amusing anecdote is told of one Western Congressman who endeavoured to account for the dimensions of his travelling bill by arguing that the nearest route from his home to Washington lay round Cape Horn. There is also an allowance of \$125 a year for stationery and newspapers, and by an Act of 1876, when a member of Congress is interred in the Congressional cemetery his monument is erected at the public expense. In 1894 it was estimated that the total cost of all these privileges was \$2,415,000. In the various State legislatures, the members of both Houses are paid at rates varying from \$150 to \$1500 a session, or from \$1 to \$8 a day. This system existed very generally even in colonial times in America. The members of the State legislatures, as Story points out,² "are not always paid out of

¹ *Times*, September 1, 1897.

² *Commentaries on the Constitution*, i. 603. [I am indebted for most of this information about the American system to Mr. W. Ashburner, of Boston, Mass., and Lincoln's Inn.]

the public Treasury; but the practice still exists in some States of charging the amount upon the constituents," as, for instance, in Massachusetts. It must be remembered that the system was "not introduced" in the United States, as in so many other countries, "for the sake of enabling working-men to be returned as members, but on the general theory that all public work ought to be paid for."¹ As a matter of fact, very few, if any, working-men have been elected to Congress, and there, as in most salaried legislatures, the small lawyer is the usual type of member.

In Mexico, members of both Houses are paid \$3000 a year; and both Chambers are salaried in Brazil, in Bolivia (at the rate of 200 bolivianos, or £17. 10s. a month, and travelling expenses), the Argentine Republic (at the rate of 12,000 pesos a year), and Paraguay (at the rate of £200 of our money). But the constant revolutions in the Republics of Latin America make it difficult to procure exact information up to date on this subject.

¹ Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*. "The Lower House in West Australia has just passed a resolution for the payment of members in both Houses."—*St. James's Gazette*, November 26, 1897.

PARNELLISM AND PRACTICAL POLITICS.

THE dawn of the year of our Lord 1898 is an appropriate occasion for much searching of heart among Irishmen of all creeds, parties, and sections. The predominant feeling among most Irishmen at the present time may be described as a queer blend of apathy and anxiety. Of the general apathy there can be no doubt. The rival organs of the rival Nationalist sections conscientiously perform their accustomed task, which is to describe one set of meetings as magnificent successes and all other meetings as more or less dismal failures. All that is meant for the common public, and, no doubt, imposes on a very respectable section of it. But the average observer knows vastly better, even though he does not care to get himself called a backslider or a crank by expressing his knowledge openly. To the end of time it will be possible to muster a crowd in Ireland by means of a Member of Parliament and a band. But the decline of all Nationalist enthusiasm—so far, at least, as any constitutional movement is concerned—is a fact that can be denied only by special pleaders or reckless partisans. Meetings galore are held, and the country is “organised,” “reorganised,” and “organised” over and over again. The same majestic processions of Members of Parliament pass and repass across the same Dillonite, Healyite, or Redmondite stages. The same impressive appeals are made, at frequent intervals, though with steadily diminishing success, to save Ireland by supporting this or that set of gentlemen in Parliament. The “evicted tenants,” to whom their happier brethren were bound by every tie of honour, are practically abandoned, a beggarly couple of thousand pounds representing all that a joint committee of the sections has been able to do for them within the last eighteen months. “The country is dead!” is the familiar comment, in fair, market-place, and committee-room. History is repeating itself with a vengeance. The National movement is in the melting-pot foretold by Mr. Healy at the famous Leinster Hall meeting. But what is going to rise to the troubled surface? What elements are going to prevail amid the chaos?

It is well known that the physical force men reluctantly gave Mr. Parnell his chance, and that with his fall and death the more advanced among them held themselves absolved from any further

toleration of parliamentaryism. The effect of this declaration might easily have been neutralised if the sectional leaders had got the length—even while maintaining separate papers, separate policies, and separate organisations—of abstaining from personal ridicule and vituperation of one another. But they were not equal to this restraint on their emotions. They could never forego the luxury of demonstrating the unfailing wisdom of their councils and the unfailing imbecility of those opposed to them. They could not so much as act together for the sake of “amnesty,” or in telling her Majesty’s faithful Commons that Ireland was the one small portion of her vast dominions in which prosperity had diminished, and public liberty had not proportionally increased, during the sixty years of her wonderful reign. First of all came the unwise prophecies of Mr. John Dillon, Mr. William O’Brien, Mr. Michael Davitt, and others, that the return of the Liberal party to power in 1892 would mean the immediate release of the Irish political prisoners, the immediate reinstatement of the evicted tenants, and an immediate fight to the death for Home Rule. Then, when Home Rule was hung up, the political prisoners still in jail, and the evicted tenants still upon the roadside, came Mr. John E. Redmond’s eloquent but completely unfulfilled promises of a “Policy of Fight.” Last, though not least, came Mr. Justin McCarthy’s rash boast that the Irish held the Government “in the hollow of their hands,” and a tax upon Irish whisky as the sum-total of practical results. To make confusion worse confounded, came the break between Dillonites and Healyites, the break between Messrs. Redmond and Harrington, the wordy duel between *United Ireland* and the *Daily Independent*, and the establishment of the *Daily Nation*, to scatter coals of fire on Dillonites and Redmondites alike. Is it a matter of surprise that as we approach the Centenary Celebration of the Rebellion of 1798 the apostles of armed revolution are once again to the fore? Many of them are earnest and deeply respected men. A few of them are suspects, breaking parliamentary bread and drawing parliamentary pay, while chatting volubly about their irreconcilable contempt of parliamentarism of any kind. All of them, unhappily, can point to the present parliamentary *débâcle* as a justification in full of their pessimistic prophecies, and as a reason for a drastic change in the method of advancing Irish claims. Thousands of Irish Americans bitterly hostile to Great Britain will soon visit the battlefields of ’98. All the memories of that dreadful time will be revived with an intensity of which those who know not Ireland can little dream. The ‘Ninety-Eight Centenary may pass off, quietly enough, but it may easily prove the death of the constitutional agitation for Home Rule. The ostentatious exclusion of all Members of Parliament from the Dublin Centenary Executive is significant; and

there is seen the spectacle of employés of the *Independent* and *Freeman* figuring prominently on that body, while Messrs. Redmond and Dillon are held to be unworthy of the honour.

It is not too late to avert the danger, or to reconstitute an effective Parliamentary movement. But the time has arrived for Mr. John Redmond, in particular, to be told that he must gravely reconsider his position if he does not wish, not merely to cool the ardour of a large section of his followers—which he has done already—but to let numbers of unhappy young men pass into the toils of the secret societies, with the usual train of informers, arrests, and imprisonments. It would be idle to ignore the fact that the great bulk of such physical force men as took any side in the Parnellite split took the Parnellite side. The older and wiser men, the men who remember 1867, are shrewd enough to realise the present impossibility of any successful revival of the Fenian movement, and have too great a sense of responsibility to encourage futile and dangerous hopes. But there are thousands of younger men—men who cannot personally remember the betrayal and selling of Fenianism, and who are lending an all too ready ear to the siren voices of revolt; and these are the men, for the greater part, whose energies Mr. John Redmond is allowing to drift into perilous directions.

There is no wish in any quarter to be too exacting in judging Mr. John Redmond. In many respects he occupies a difficult and invidious position. It would be as unreasonable to contrast his leadership with that of Mr. Parnell as to institute a similar comparison in the case of Mr. Justin McCarthy, or Mr. John Dillon, or Mr. Timothy Healy. It is always very difficult to follow a very great man. Mr. Redmond has high-class natural abilities, a fine voice, a good presence, a born faculty for stating a case at its best, an unlimited command of fluently sonorous and well-turned phrases, and an excellent House of Commons manner. It is also doing him no more than common justice to admit that his general style and tone have been such as to raise the art of Irish political controversy from the dirty slough into which it has fallen of late years. How is it that, with these excellent qualities, the Parnellite enthusiasm should have so fallen away under his leadership?

It is not the least of Ireland's many misfortunes that public criticism of her public men by followers of those men is outside the domain of practical politics. English statesmen have the advantage of honest criticism by fearless supporters, and of knowing that such criticism implies a volume of opinion in their own parties of sufficient importance to merit serious consideration. In an Irish party, a Labourer or a Londonderry would be impossible. With us, a man who criticises his leader is a "crank"—a little more criticism, and he gets himself branded as a traitor. The evil is aggravated tenfold

by the control exercised by rival leaders over the rival papers. A criticism of Mr. Redmond by the *Independent*, or of Mr. Dillon by the *Freeman*, or of Mr. Healy by the *Nation*, is simply unthinkable. The result is that discontent can only mutter—it cannot speak out; and the poor “leaders” are themselves misled. Mr. Redmond, for instance, cannot grasp the true meaning of the waning vigour and the miserably reduced funds of his party. Why? Simply because the *Independent* (of which he is chairman-director) never ceases to proclaim that he never did make, never does make, and never could make a single mistake, and never ceases to assure him that the white-heat of enthusiasm for Parnell glows with undiminished ardour for the Member for Waterford. The truth is, of course, that the general paralysis has spread even in Dublin, the citadel of Parnellism. “It was a strange thing,” said Mr. William Field, M.P., speaking at a recent meeting, “that many men in Dublin who proclaimed themselves ardent Parnellites had abstained from giving that support, either moral, or financial, or by their presence, which they should give the party to which they professed to belong. He did not understand this policy of inaction and apathy.” If even in Dublin itself ward meetings are few where they were frequent; if leading local men who once kept themselves in the fighting line are now dropping to the rear; if Parnellite Town Councillors and Poor-law Guardians, who were formerly never missed on such occasions, now look on Parnellite meetings with languid interest; if the men whose sovereigns and “fivers” were formerly always to be counted upon are making themselves scarce—Mr. Field may be sure that he and his colleagues are at fault, rather than the people who guaranteed their Parliamentary existence. Money, when all is said and done, is a solid pledge of political affection; men do not lightly drop out of an active part in a movement to which they have paid repeated and substantial tribute in the shape of pounds, shillings, and pence; they rarely do so unless they are haunted by a dim fear of “throwing good money after bad.” That is the fear haunting the men of whom Mr. William Field complains. Its existence may be foolishly ignored by optimists; its expression may be forbidden by flatterers and parasites. But it is there, and its results will be felt on an increasing scale if its causes are not removed.

Unluckily for Mr. Redmond, he never had the shadow of a genuine consultative body to fall back upon. The scheme of organisation formulated at a convention held under Mr. Parnell's presidency in the year 1891 was never carried out; and after Mr. Parnell's death Mr. Redmond left the whole practical work in the hands of Mr. Harrington, whom he now disowns. Mr. Harrington is a man of strong will and immense application, and, doing the bulk of the work, he not unnaturally took the lion's share of the power. The end of it all was that, in the whole of the House of Commons, it

would have been difficult to find eleven wealthy Liberal manufacturers, or eleven wealthy Conservative squires, who consulted their leading supporters less than did Mr. John Redmond and his ten colleagues. Mr. Redmond still imagines that because no serious dissent is voiced at his yearly convention there are no malcontents; he fancies that many of his best supporters in town and country are not deeply dissatisfied, because, on the morrow of Parnell Sunday, they do not like to find fault with him at a public meeting under the surveillance of hostile newspapers. He is making a disastrous mistake. His supporters are perfectly alive to the fact that he is altogether out of touch with them; that he rarely allows them to discuss the situation with him with that fulness and frankness that private consultation can alone secure, and that they are rarely "taken into council"—as the *Independent* always delicately puts it—unless funds are needed. The growing volume of inarticulate dissatisfaction is not to be denied. The *Independent* duly described the last annual convention as being as good as any of its predecessors, if not better; but it simultaneously published a deadly refutation of the statement, in the shape of its own list of prominent Parnellites in attendance. The meeting was crowded, and representative of much that is best in the country life of Ireland; but the "platform" was no more than a remnant of the ex-M.P.s, candidates, barristers, doctors, solicitors, merchants, and substantial traders who once thronged round Mr. Redmond's chair at the annual muster of the party. A comparison of the *Independent's* "platform" lists of 1897 with those of 1893 or 1895 is somewhat painfully instructive reading. The numbers of the rank and file are barely maintained and the old vanguard is sadly wasted.

For the purpose of this article it is necessary to premise that the Independent Nationalist policy, in theory—though not, unfortunately, in practice—is to make Ireland "block the way" once more; to restore the Irish Question to the position it held when Mr. Gladstone described all further British legislation as fruit in a high-walled and double-locked orchard, to which Home Rule was the only key; to insist, with every energy that parliamentary forms and devotion to parliamentary duty can allow, upon the shameful ban of inequality left upon Ireland after fifty years of far-reaching democratic legislation for England, Scotland, and Wales; and to make the path of the British legislator—whether *Liberal* or *Tory*—a hard and thorny path until Ireland obtains her rights. In eloquent words, as specific and binding as the wit of man could devise, Mr. John Redmond laid down that policy at the fine Parnellite convention of 1893. Amid tumultuous cheering, renewed again and again, he declared that he and his colleagues had cast their last vote for a Liberal Bill, and that, from that day forth, their mission in Parliament was not to support British reforms, whether introduced by a Liberal or a

Unionist Government. It was not many days before hundreds of Mr. Redmond's best friends were aghast at seeing the report of another speech, in which he deliberately abandoned the strong and clearly-defined position he had taken up in the Rotunda Round Room. He would agree to one Liberal Bill on this account; he would agree to another Liberal Bill, such as Welsh Disestablishment, on that account; and so on, all along the line. For the whole of the ensuing session, for the whole remainder of that Parliament, Mr. John Redmond's notion of "blocking the way" appeared to consist of a highly irregular attendance in the House of Commons, a positive support of the Liberal Government on some occasions, a merely negative opposition to it on many other occasions, and a habitual disregard of Mr. Parnell's antipathy to the "pairing" system—an antipathy justifiable tenfold in the case of a small band of Members whose only parliamentary importance must rest on a regular attendance to their duties, and an actual, not merely nominal, "Policy of Fight." From the rejection of the Home Rule Bill by the House of Lords in 1893 to the General Election of 1895 the only difference between the attitude of Messrs. McCarthy and Redmond towards the Liberal party was a difference entirely to Mr. Redmond's disadvantage. Mr. McCarthy held, wrongly and credulously as Parnellites believed then and believe now, that so long as Home Rule was allowed a place of any sort or kind on the Liberal programme the Liberal leaders should command the Irish vote. Acting on that theory, he fully supported the Liberal party, Mr. Healy—whose belated discoveries on the subject are at their proper discount—being in complete accord with him. Mr. Redmond, on the other hand, although confronted with a small and unstable Ministerial majority—to which nine votes, counting eighteen on a division, were a matter of serious concern—did no more than orate and threaten: he never struck one effective blow. Parnellites believe that if Anti-Parnellites had tightened their grip on the Government they declared themselves to hold "in the hollow of their hands" Home Rule would have remained in the forefront of the Liberal platform, to the advantage of Ireland, and certainly not to the detriment of the Liberal party itself. We believe that the Anti-Parnellites did the wrong thing. But the division lists and parliamentary reports of that time prove beyond doubt or question that Mr. John Redmond did neither the one thing nor the other.

We now come to the second chapter of Mr. Redmond's leadership. At the General Election of 1895 he lost two seats and gained four, the Parnellites returning to Parliament eleven strong instead of nine. The Unionists came into power with a majority without precedent in modern times. Now, it was Mr. Parnell's essential doctrine, the paramount idea on which his Independent opposition depended, that it was a very bad thing for Ireland for *either* of the

two great British parties to be too strong as against the other. His beau-ideal of a parliamentary situation was a balance of British parties so nearly even that an Irish party could at any moment procure the victory or the defeat of the Government of the day. Mr. Redmond speaks constantly of Independent opposition, but has done, and is doing, nothing to restore that "balance of power" by which Independent opposition can become of the smallest use. If the Unionist Government had enjoyed anything like a reasonable majority, Mr. Redmond might reasonably have said to the Liberals: "I command twenty-two votes on a division—they are to be had on certain terms and conditions." But Mr. Redmond is not in a position to impose conditions, and his numerical insignificance in the House is aggravated by the slipshod attendance that he and his colleagues think fit to give. Mr. Redmond pleads that by harassing the Unionists he would be helping the Liberals. The plea amounts to this: that because Parnellites had a bitter quarrel, and one they believe to have been a righteous one, with the Liberal party, Parnellite members are only to vote against the present Government on occasions when they could not possibly abstain from so doing; and that they are to take no further active part against a huge Anti-Irish coalition, with a bloated majority, and the motto of "No Home Rule" blazoned on its standard! Mr. Redmond is always telling us that he refuses to be the hack of the Liberal party. Nobody wants him to be the hack of the Liberal party, or of any other party. But Mr. Parnell was not treated with such generosity at any time by the Unionists as can account for the extreme gentility with which Mr. Redmond handles them on all occasions. We have not forgotten the wicked Pigott conspiracy. Neither do we forget that Lord Salisbury was the one and only English leading statesman to degrade himself by casting a brutal and ungentlemanly taunt at Mr. Parnell in the bitterest hour of his life. There are some elements of mystery in the relationship between Mr. Redmond and the Unionists. It was difficult to account for his purely formal support of the Nationalist candidate for Stephen's Green at the last bye-election for that constituency—a constituency prized by the Unionists more than any other in all Ireland, except, perhaps, that of South County Dublin, concerning which Mr. Redmond has betrayed a like indifference. Still less easy is it to understand why a Parnellite M.P. should call "cheers for the Afridis" in Dublin, while at Westminster not a Parnellite voice should have been raised against the men who plotted against the freedom of the Boers and turned the land of the Matabele into a hideous shambles; or why Mr. John Redmond selected the time of the Jameson raid to pay totally uncalled-for compliments to the arch-conspirator. It would be well if Mr. Redmond would cultivate some of the dignified reserve of the late Mr. Parnell, and

if he would remember that things he could do usefully and becomingly as a first lieutenant are altogether beneath the dignity of a party chairman, no matter how small the party may happen to be. Can the wildest flight of fancy, for example, stretch to the idea of a Parnell going to a fashionable tourist meeting in a fashionable London hall, and using a verse from a passionate love poem by one of our most famous Nationalist writers as an appeal to Englishmen to visit the beautiful places of Ireland?

Instead of trying to consolidate Nationalist energies, Mr. Redmond has rather scattered them on a multitude of objects which may or may not be laudable in themselves, but do tend to distract the attention of the people from the one predominant aim of Home Rule. His action in joining Mr. Horace Plunkett's "Recess Committee" is a striking case in point. I have nothing to say against the motives which inspired that committee, but must note that its formation was not (as is commonly assumed) a new idea, but an idea that had been vainly dangled before the old Nationalist party for a space of some ten or fifteen years. Innumerable times were we told in the Irish Unionist Press that Irish Unionists were not only willing but anxious to meet us in council for the promotion of agricultural and industrial prosperity. The cool and wary Parnell never encouraged these siren overtures, and would have trod with an iron heel on the Nationalist member who sat down to a Round Table whereof the promoter and guiding spirit had declared "his belief that it would diminish the demand for Home Rule." But Mr. Redmond went a great deal further. He put himself in the utterly false and undignified position of committing his party, in his own person as chairman of that party, to the proposals of the Recess Committee, while the chairman of the Irish Unionist party publicly repudiated it. He was like a general opening up negotiations for an armistice with a totally unauthorised person! Of the Report of the Recess Committee I can only say that it contains one statement that amounts to a cruel libel on the struggling Irish farmer. The assertion that "ours is by common consent one of the simplest and most barbarous systems of agriculture in Western Europe" is a statement of the wild-cat order; and it is deplorable that any Irish Member of Parliament—still more so any leader of a Nationalist party—should have been trapped into signing his name to it. The final upshot of the committee was the production of a Bill to add one more to the many irresponsible and highly-paid and over-staffed "boards" with which Ireland is already blessed. There is ample official machinery already in existence to lend a helping hand to the agricultural and industrial development of Ireland. It is the Treasury, not the machinery, that is so much to blame. A new set of heads of departments, with a swarm of clerks and minor officials, can do no more than could be done for the country at this very

moment if the money were granted; and for a Nationalist to go cap in hand to Government for another of the non-elected and irresponsible boards of which Nationalists have been complaining for a generation past is exactly what a delegate had the courage to call it at Mr. Redmond's convention a year or two ago—it is “a negation of Parnellism.”

It is ridiculous to dignify with such phrases as “Policy of Active Combat” the easy-going, *dilettante* parliamentarianism of Mr. John Redmond. The records of the last session gave deplorable evidence of the emptiness of his constant promises to make Ireland “block the way.” At the outset of that session more funds were appealed for, on the ground that he and his colleagues were going to do active work, and that, on the Estimates particularly, they were going to fight the Government inch by inch and tooth and nail. All the world knows what actually happened. The promise was magnificent—the performance was a farce. For a great part of this session, which he and his papers had told us was going to be so vitally important, Mr. Redmond was on a private lecturing tour in the United States, and his colleagues literally went to pieces. Even on his return neither he nor they buckled to their work. As for the much-talked-of Estimates, any trouble the Government had over them came from entirely different quarters of the House. There was one little comedietta, in which Mr. Redmond and three of his friends got themselves suspended amid screams of laughter, and that was all. So far as *they* were concerned, the tide of millions flowed on with scarce a ruffle on its golden surface.

Mr. Redmond must respectfully be informed, in addition, that a deep and widespread anxiety exists among large numbers of those who would give him the thoroughgoing support which they have for the present withdrawn—a wish to know whether he has any definite policy to lay down for them for the guidance of their conduct towards the Liberal and Tory parties of Great Britain. Are we to adopt the sneering, “You should ‘a said so afore” attitude of the *Irish Daily Independent* toward such Liberal candidates as courageously make “Home Rule for Ireland” their chief appeal to the electors? Are we to keep *all* our hard words for that English party with which we had a bitter dispute, but which has introduced two Home Rule Bills in two different Parliaments? And are we to reserve *all* our patience and consideration for that English party which, infinitely above and beyond all others, has slandered, insulted, and oppressed us, and which lent the whole tremendous engine of the Treasury and of the Executive for the purpose of proving, before a specially packed Commission, that our nationality was a lie, that our patriotism was a mere greed of money, and that our beloved and splendid chief was a common suborner of common murderers? If so, Mr. Redmond may as well know that there are multitudes of good,

independent Nationalists who will shortly be saying "Good-bye!" without adding "Good-luck!"

If instead of dabbling in Recess Committees and co-operative stores, creameries and tourist meetings *à la mode*, Mr. John Redmond will even now—even at this eleventh hour—"pull himself together"; if he will only revert to the methods of Biggar and Parnell; if he will only concentrate his energies and excellent faculties on making a bluff, unhalting, uncompromising fight against the foreign government of Ireland; if he will only read his own speech at the Rotunda in 1893, and resolve to do nothing else but do his best to fulfil the pledges he then gave to his supporters, all may yet be well. A grave responsibility rests upon him. Greater men than himself have been destroyed by a ring-fence of toadies and intriguers. Daniel O'Connell was one of them. If Mr. Redmond chooses to bask much longer in the sunshine of flattery, a great volume of Irish Nationalist activity will be lost to the cause he professes to espouse. Much will he have to answer for if, to make matters worse, that volume of activity, or a great proportion of it, should flow into fatal channels!

X.M.P.

FEMINISM.

IN his brief but valuable *Autobiography*, John Stuart Mill records his general concurrence with the connected view, presented by the St. Simonian school, of the natural order of human progress :

"and especially with their division of all history into organic periods and critical periods. During the organic periods (they said) mankind accept with firm conviction some positive creed, claiming more or less of truth and adaptation to the needs of humanity. Under its influence they make all the progress compatible with the creed, and finally outgrow it ; when a period follows of criticism and negation, in which mankind lose their old convictions without acquiring any new ones of a general or authoritative character, except the conviction that the old are false. The period of Greek and Roman polytheism, so long as really believed, in by instructed Greeks and Romans, was an organic period, succeeded by the critical or sceptical period of the Greek philosophers. Another organic period came in with Christianity. The corresponding critical period began with the Reformation, has lasted ever since, still lasts, and cannot altogether cease until a new organic period has been inaugurated by the triumph of a yet more advanced creed."—*Op. cit.*, p. 163.

Mill's theme in a previous generation is strongly recalled by some words of our Oxford Professor of Poetry during the year now past : "As the chant of the monks on the Capitol called up in the mind of the historian the long drama of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, so the monuments of architecture, painting, sculpture, and poetry record the dynastic revolutions in the march of human thought."¹

The thought so similarly formulated is, indeed, of wide modern origin and acceptance. Yet, of the many minds that have noted as clearly as did our last Laureate himself that "the old order changeth, yielding place to the new," by none, till within most recent time, has the deduction been carried prominently forward to any clearly-defined fresh phase of human intellect and action which may pervade and constitute a newer "organic period." Those who gave expression to the very thoughts from which we may now evidence and date the advent of higher light seem to have been almost entirely unconscious of the full import of their own utterances, the depth and breadth and specific bearing of their own promptings. Even to Mill himself in his early days might, perhaps, somewhat of such a judgment apply.

¹ Courthope, *Hist. of English Poetry*, ch. 1.

Nor need the suggestion appear unreasonable or censorious. For, as *natura non facit saltum*, the course of her action, however rapid, is still a connected and, in so far, a smooth one; so that to a human soul borne on the current the actual extent of change may not be presently realisable, but only by comparison of sufficiently separated epochs. Mill was within the swirl of an eventful time, whose impetus was yet to reach to the dawn of another "organic period"; which dawn he also, later on, perceived to be imminent. Even during the threescore years previous to his first study of the Simonian theories (c. 1830), the world had witnessed at intervals the efforts of three separate nationalities to initiate a fuller period of humanity. American independence, French republicanism, and English parliamentary reform were alike movements toward the better order; but not one has yet reached to full scope of the light. Each had essayed a fraternity of masculinity alone—a legislation of humanity in which man might be brother to fellow-man, and yet not brother to sister woman.

Thus, unhappily, the boasted birthright of American liberty was arrogated and monopolised by the selfish male child. The equal claims of his sister have been evaded, and her protests either overruled or treated with contumely. At the present instant the most ignorant male negro in the Northern or Southern States has a legislative privilege denied to every woman there, of whatever race, whatever culture; the coloured man can give a vote for the guidance and governance of the land of his adoption (including the making of laws for its women); the white woman, no matter what her education, refinement, and professional or business ability, is denied any share in the voting¹ that shall place the government of her mother-country in the hands of principle or of profligacy. There is, to British minds, an unreasoning social ostracism of the African race in the United States, both North and South; yet that, in the face of this antipathy, the chivalry of the South or the common-sense of the North should not entrust to the sisters of their own flesh and blood an equal human right with that which they concede to the meanest male of the despised breed is an incident of sex bias, a landmark of mental barbarism, for a future age to look back upon with incredulous amazement.

But, in this matter, are we Britons in a position to cast a stone at our purblind cousins? In our vaunted land the qualification for parliamentary voting is specifically barred to infants, idiots, criminals, and women!. Nay, the woman is in worse case than a criminal. The vilest male miscreant when his term of imprisonment is expired has purged his electoral disability also, and again becomes as entitled

¹ This reproach does not apply to the Western States of Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and Montana, in each of which the electoral suffrage is already extended to women equally with men.

to vote as the most virtuous of his fellow-electors; but no amount of mental or physical effort on her own part can solve an English-woman of her political disability—the mark of national nullity branded upon their mothers and sisters by an ignoble band of masculine legislators. And did our Reform Act amend aught in this matter? In the course of the protracted Parliamentary debates one woman of determined spirit and Yorkshire blood managed to get a petition presented, claiming some consideration for woman's share in electoral right; and the appeal was discarded with "loud laughter and derision."

So again, in France, the asserted ruling principle of the Great Revolution—"la carrière ouverte aux talents"—applied only when those talents were possessed by males; the special legal embargos and artificial incapacities already inflicted upon women were retained and even increased by the Code Législatif of the small-souled Napoleon, and received the approval of the vast majority of the privileged maledom. And although the sheer force of circumstances has compelled the concession to woman of some degree of recognition and of freedom in mercantile or (lately) professional pursuits, yet all civic capacity or function has been denied her; and the time is still to be measured by weeks since her signature has at last been permitted any validity as witness to even the most trivial legal or civic document. While, too, at the time of the Revolution, woman might have pleaded even more widely than man:

"Contre nous de la tyrannie
L'étendard sanglant est levé,"

yet so completely was the occlusion of her equality of right, human or social, accepted as a mere matter of course, that this injustice scarcely aroused a murmur in either sex. So true is it that—as Condorcet pointed out at the time, in the almost solitary plea uttered for woman's equality of civic right—"custom may familiarise mankind with the violation of their natural rights to such an extent that, even among those who have lost or been deprived of these rights, no one thinks of reclaiming them, or is even conscious that they have suffered any injustice."¹

Even Mill's own short essay; *A Few Observations on the French Revolution* (written in 1833), is no exception to this silence. Doubtless the brevity of his article may be pleaded for the absence of the desired reference; yet it is certain that such an omission would have been impossible to him in the fuller light and feeling which he speedily knew. Already he had "most positively dissented from" the expressed opinion of his father, that "women may, consistently with good government, be excluded from the suffrage, because their

¹ Opening words of Condorcet's *Esquisse sur l'Admission des Femmes au Droit de Cité*. Dr. Alice Vickary's translation.

interest is the same with that of men.”¹ Moreover, now was beginning the intellectual aid of what he afterwards termed “the friendship which has been the honour and chief blessing of my existence, as well as the source of a great part of all that I have attempted to do, or hope to effect hereafter, for human improvement.”² And the mutual effort of that friendship, which culminated in a most happy marriage, was continuously in the direction of securing for woman equality of right with man, to the reciprocal benefit of both sexes.

In republishing after her death his wife's essay, *Enfranchisement of Women* (which had first appeared in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July 1851), Mill, in a special preface, explains that the paper was meant simply for “the general reader,” because “the question, in her opinion, was in a stage in which no treatment but the most calmly argumentative could be useful, while many of the strongest arguments were necessarily omitted as being unsuited for popular effect.”³ Very similar are the considerations which even yet keep the discussion too much on the lower plane indicated by Mill, whose further declaration is that “had she lived to write out all her thought on this great question, she would have produced something as far transcending in profundity the present essay as, had she not placed a rigid restraint on her feelings, she would have excelled it in fervid eloquence.” Mill conveys his own impression of the nature and compass of the feeling and forecast which she had not deemed it well to utter at an immature time by saying: “I venture to prophesy that, if mankind continue to improve, their spiritual history for ages to come will be the progressive working out of her thoughts and realisation of her conceptions.”

It is evident here that the aspirations of these two noble souls were by no means limited to the region of transient politics only. Civic personality is, indeed, in the eyes of thoughtful men or women, but a stepping-stone to the position from which loftier purposes of humanity may be achieved. Yet that stepping-stone is as needful to woman as to man, for growth of the individual, and for power in the work of the world; it is even indispensable to woman, to assure due respect for her mind and body by the ordinary man, as being no longer a nullity, but his own equal in electoral and civil power. And it is the very effort of woman for mental and human progress that has brought her in these later days to realise how vital to that effort is her equal share in the selection of the needful legislators. Mary Wollstonecraft, in her *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), asks for her sex little more than freedom for mental improvement and the social treatment of an intelligent human being; pleading but once, in the very last chapter of her book, that women should be made—if but for man's own benefit—not only “rational creatures,” but also “free citizens.” Man's utter neglect of such

¹ *Autob.* p. 104.² *Op. cit.* p. 184.³ *Dissertations*, ii. p. 412.

considerations or representations from supplicants unpossessed of political power led Mrs. Wheeler, in 1825, to the essential preliminary claim for "the rights of women, political and civil, on a perfect equality with those of men."¹

The fuller formulation and justification of this claim was made by Mrs. Mill in 1851, as already mentioned; the ruling motive of her demand again being that its withholding forms "a bar, almost insuperable while it lasts, to any really vital improvement either in the character or in the social condition of the human race" (*loc. cit.*). After a further interval appeared (in 1864) a remarkable book—*Woman and Her Era*—by an American writer, Mrs. Eliza W. Farnham: an exposition of the general racial benefits to be effected by the juster treatment of woman. It is a work of deep study and forethought, marred only by an occasional trace of early theological training, yet, despite this, unyielding in its claim for a higher status and recognition of femininity: a postulate for which it were certainly vain to seek support, or even sanction, whether in Mosaism with its humanly male deity—"narrowing the Supreme to sex"—and its correspondingly dark tenets maligning womanhood, or in the offshoot, Christianity, cankered throughout with the same inherited unreason.

Within the present decade the progressing and intimate relation of the political and human aspects of the argument is tersely set forth by Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy:

"The main reason why so many thoughtful women now claim direct Parliamentary representation is an unselfish one. They desire to take their full share in the service of the race, to help to solve those grave social problems now so urgently pressing, and which demand for their solution the combined resources of wisdom, experience, and heart of both halves of humanity. They know that the time is fast coming—if, indeed, it be not already come—which will need for its direction and control something more than diplomatic cleverness or political manœuvring, which will demand the clearer conscience and the more sensitive perception of justice born of imaginative sympathy. It is because they hope and believe that in virtue of their faculty of motherhood they can contribute somewhat of these elements to the world's well-being, and can thus speed its progress towards a nobler future, that they claim full right and power to follow and fulfil their highest conceptions of duty."—*The Osheroe Case and its Consequences*, p. 17.

This vein of feeling and action is increasingly confirmed by the most thoughtful women of the day. It was the dominant feature of woman's demand for political right as enounced by the National Congress of Mothers, held at Washington, D.C., during the past year: a large and imposing assembly of delegates from each of the States

¹ *Appeal of Women*, p. xiii. This *Appeal*, the work of a masculine pen, was written by William Thompson, to perpetuate the "expression of those feelings, sentiments, and reasonings which had emanated from the mind" of his esteemed friend, Mrs. Wheeler.

of the Union. Mrs. Helen H. Gardener urged, as a racial argument for justice, that—

"Subject mothers never did, and subject mothers never will, produce a race of free, well-poised, liberty-loving, justice-practising children. Maternity is an awful power. It blindly strikes back at injustice with a force that is a fearful menace to mankind. And the race which is born of mothers who are harassed, bullied, subordinated, or made the victims of blind passion or power, or of mothers who are simply too petty and self-debased to feel their subject status, cannot fail to continue to give the horrible spectacles we have always had of war, of crime, of vice, of trickery, of double-dealing, of pretence, of lying, of arrogance, of subserviency, of incompetence, of brutality, and, alas! of insanity, idiocy, and disease, added to a fearful and unnecessary mortality."—Paper, *Moral Responsibility of Women in Heredity*.

Thus the general good of humanity has been, and still is, the persistent ultimate purpose of woman's effort for political right; and the recognition, by both sexes alike, of her equality of claim is, without doubt, the ruling factor in our human advance towards a newer "organic period"—a period concerning which Mill himself thus predicated:

"The time is now come for the morality of justice. We are entering into an order of things in which justice will again be the primary virtue; grounded as before on equal, but now also on sympathetic association; having its root no longer in the instinct of equals for self-protection, but in a cultivated sympathy between them; and no one being now left out, but an equal measure being extended to all."—*The Subjection of Women*, p. 80.

This condition—which acknowledges in woman a perfect equality of human right and human soul with man—had been specifically denied under the preceding "organic period," that of Christianity; whose epoch of criticism has, as Mill announced, long been in process. That criticism has since been yet more searching than in Mill's time; and its present position is, roundly, that the Christian religious system—apart from sundry knowledge or morality traceable to prior or contemporaneous sources, and which has never been a Christian or religious monopoly¹—is now found to present little more than a congeries of legends and ethics and superstitions, in which each of its many sects picks and chooses at discretion to formulate its own convenient set of dogmas, even to the palliation (for an assumedly "useful" end) of censurable methods which have been and still are the staple of the system's existence—as lingering advocates thus openly admit:

¹ Professor Alfred R. Wallace relates—of races innocent of all religious creed: "I have lived with communities of savages in South America and in the East, who have no laws or law courts but the public opinion of the village freely expressed. Each man scrupulously respects the rights of his fellow, and any infraction of those rights rarely or never takes place. . . . Incitements to great crimes are wanting and petty ones are repressed, partly by the influence of public opinion, but chiefly by that natural sense of justice and of his neighbour's right, which seems to be, in some degree, inherent in every race of man."—*Malay Archipelago*, ch. xi.

"The fear of hell may be but as a hangman's whip; the human pack cannot be kept within bounds without the lash. The promise of the joys of Paradise to the faithful may savour of bribery and corruption, but without such tremendous inducement most founders of religions have felt themselves powerless to cope with the rude elemental forces of the fallen nature of man."—*Review of Reviews*, October 1897, p. 344.

It is in those words—"the fallen nature"—that lies the all-pervading difference between the organic period, now moribund, and that which is to come—the difference between the deadening idea of man's lapse from a former height, and the life-giving and inspiring knowledge that his career has been and is an evolutionary and advancing one, in which his own effort can carry him ever higher. It is a most grave responsibility that lies on the Christian system in having adopted (to the same "useful" end?) the Mosaic legend of the "Fall"—a myth in which is concentrated or fossilised the ancient Oriental depreciation of woman and the primitive ignorance of the sacredness of maternity; a fictioned story, in which is framed man's self-excuse for the degradation to which his unchecked lower passions alone had consigned his enslaved companion. The evil results of that dogmatic teaching have been incalculable, and its effects on both sexes insidious and lasting; insomuch that the implication of woman's inferior human status is accepted unquestioningly by men innumerable, who would yet reject with scorn any credence in the fable of the fault and special "curse" upon which her subjection to man is popularly based.

It needs not to debate further the harsh Mosaic and Christian dogmas regarding woman; they vanish forthwith in the light of the coming period which Mill augured as one of justice—that high quality in which the passing period has been so pitifully lacking that the woman half of mankind has been kept in general serfdom and misery. For it is not to political or sacerdotal injustice alone that the censure applies; woman's education and advance, mental, physical, and social, have alike been opposed in the selfish or fancied interests of male humanity. Happily not to all men does this guilt attach; there are those who desire the reign of justice as keenly as does any woman, and who long for its accession, if only to wipe out the ignominy of an unworthy course in which they have been involuntary and protesting participators. With some aid from such of these men as were in a position of influence, and even more by dint of her own indomitable perseverance, woman has vanquished many obstacles, and is slowly, yet surely, acquiring a wider and more generous position and recognition.

Yet the onward course is still subject to obstruction by self and prejudice. Concerning woman's claim to the Parliamentary suffrage public opinion is steadfastly growing;¹ meanwhile, in Parliament

¹ It may surely be taken as evidence of a general (if even an unconscious)

itself, assumed well-wishers of the cause in either political faction are, for the most part, "letting I dare not wait upon I would," until one party shall make some definite official move, when the other will either oppose or outbid it, as the party tactics of the instant may dictate. In the matter of university or professional education there are also occasional rebuffs. In cultured England it reads like an incredible anachronism—an ugly obtrusion of a bygone darker age into present intelligence—that the University of Cambridge in the year 1897 did, by a sufficing majority (consisting, however, mainly of benefited non-residents), refuse to allow to women—who had passed with distinguished merit the far more arduous "Honours" examination—even the ordinary "degree" which is granted to annual shoals of males of lesser talent or industry. One resultant incongruity is that no B.A. or M.A. "Cantab." can now be accepted without question as even the equal in mental calibre of many an educated woman unpossessed of similar alphabetical adornment to her name. The keener, and kinder, common-sense of various other British universities has, however, rejected the puerility of sexual distinction in matters intellectual; and the "face value" of their diplomas will evidently not deteriorate in consequence thereof.

This more magnanimous and mutually beneficial course is being gradually adopted both in Britain and abroad, and the abrogation of sex distinction is fast extending to class-work and lectures as well as to examinations and degrees. In the United States there are not only colleges for the co-education of the sexes in mixed classes, but their public schools generally have followed that system ever since their establishment, and with the best of mental and moral results. With the best of social and national results likewise, as one of their leading journals observes:

"We are persuaded that the American girl is not only distinctive, but distinguished; and we go further and declare our firm conviction that the American woman is the finest product of the age. It is gratifying, also, to believe that American men—their kindliness, their chivalry, their generosity—have contributed to the perfection of that womanhood which is the best thing we have in this country, and also the most hopeful assurance of better generations to come."—*Leslie's Weekly*, New York, October 14, 1897.

Much the larger proportion of the American public education is in the hands of women, and with the above admirable result. Not only, however, in the scholastic but in all the other professions or positions, the United States have taken the lead in accepting the talent and aid of woman and in appointing her to public office. In

abandonment of past dogmas, and the universal trend towards a juster "organic period," that religious leaders—so far severed as the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, the Chief Rabbi of England, and many others of all the various sects—have individually expressed themselves in favour of extending the Parliamentary suffrage to women on the same terms as to men.

all this meanwhile they are followed at a close distance by sundry of our own colonies, New Zealand and South Australia sharing the special honour of the "extension of the parliamentary franchise to woman. Strangely laggard and erratic has been our mother-country in this human progression. Yet she has already gone far to establish woman's right of legal individuality; nor can the full measure be long delayed in the face of the growing masculine recognition of its ultimate reciprocal benefits. Deep experience in teaching, too, both masculine and feminine, is now counselling the general co-education of the sexes, a system often adopted in our primary juvenile schools, but discontinued just at an age when the most salutary influences would be evoked. Yet in this direction also we may note progress. At Keswick in October last was laid the foundation stone of a high school for the education of advanced pupils of both sexes in mixed classes; and the Master of Balliol (Dr. Caird), who took part in the proceedings, expressed his fullest conviction of the good results of such training. Again, concerning the simple question of the fuller education of girls of advanced age, the Speaker of the House of Commons, assisting at a distribution of prizes at the High School for Girls at Carlisle (November 1897), said that for the higher schools for girls there was now "just as great a want as the want was 500 years ago for such schools as Winchester, Harrow, and Eton." On a similar occasion, at the Leamington High School for Girls (October 1897), Dr. James, head master of Rugby, further pronounced his gratification that, "both from a physical and intellectual aspect the education of women had shown wonderful development in the last few years."

For not the mind alone of woman is being educated: it is well realised by her that to the *mens sana* is essential the *corpus sanum*. In the United States "gymnastic exercise for boys and girls has been made compulsory in some schools"; and at our English girl-colleges the gymnasium is as much in use as at any boys' school. In the Eastern as in the Western world outdoor sports and exercises are of increasing vogue; a woman may be an able competitor at tennis or golf, and may cycle her ten or twelve miles an hour as easily and continuously as her male companion. Her former fatiguing and impeding dress is being "rationalised"; and on both continents there is evidence that her healthful exercise has already helped to modify the prevalence or severity of an inconvenient and depressing physical habitude formerly reputed normal. From every country come the congratulations on her increased vigour and general improvement in physique. In France, Madame Adam records with enthusiasm the beneficial results to her sisters of their new devotion to outdoor exercise, and how "Frenchwomen of the middle class, the class which is now dominant, have awakened from their apathy . . . and in their turn our girls are being brought up

in the American and English style." ¹ Mdlle. de la Ramé reports that in Italy "modern life develops the physical strength and social liberties of the female," and that the young womanhood evinces "splendid vitality and magnificent growth." ² And at the American National Congress of Mothers, already mentioned, it was strenuously insisted by Mrs. Alice Lee Moqué :

"Our duty is clear. We must recognise our responsibility, not alone to ourselves and the present, but to posterity and the future. . . . To-day, while rejoicing that the entrance to the college is open to women, we still more exult in the fact that the door to the gymnasium is unlocked and the gate to the campus unbarred. Woman's real emancipation must be from the doctor, for her growth, development, her status in the business world, and her highest ambitions as maid, wife, and mother are, and must always be dependent, not only upon her mental attainments, but upon her physical condition. Health is a necessity; woman's perfect realisation of her rights will be when she accepts the plain truth that she must not only have a sound mind but a sound body."—Paper, *Reproduction and Natural Law*.

The feminine educational movement—mental, physical, social—is spreading throughout all Europe, and it is said that even the seclusions of Islam are vibrating to the same impulse; in India and Japan the higher recognition of the capability of woman is also making headway; while in England we have seen the Chinese wife of a Celestial ambassador sharing with her husband the amenities and duties of social and public occasions. And thus, in empires olden or modern, is shown, in varying degree the prevailing current. In each quarter of the globe the growing human intellect is repudiating the childlike ideal and creed of a deified gigantic male being, and is awaking to the advancing natural truth foreseen by America's poet :

"Unfolded only out of the superbest woman of the earth is to come the superbest man of the earth :

Unfolded only out of the perfect body of a woman can a man be form'd of perfect body ;

Unfolded out of the folds of the woman's brain come all the folds of the man's brain, duly obedient ;

A man is a great thing upon the earth, and through eternity—but every jot of the greatness of man is unfolded out of woman :

First the man is shaped in the woman, he can then be shaped in himself." ³

It is to the increasing effort and aspiration of the age towards these fuller mutual conditions, physical and psychic—it is to this our truly distinctive *Zeitgeist*—that our Gallic neighbours in their facile tongue have assigned the fitting and comprehensive title of "Féminisme."

Feminism, then, is a phase of larger civilisation; it is the recognition of the autonomy and human right of woman as equal with

¹ *Humanitarian*, February 1897.

² Walt Whitman, *Leaves of Grass*.

³ *Fortnightly Review*, March 1897.

that of man. It is no lightly scoffed-at epiceanism; not the affectation of a brusque masculinity on the part of woman, or of a *dilettante* emasculateness on the part of man, but the acceptance and attainment by either sex of whatever is ennobling, be it mental or physical; the mutual repudiation and rejection of all that is unworthy. The American Walt Whitman, staunch in body as in mind, again strikes the keynote of its epoch in demanding "the great chastity of paternity to match the great chastity of maternity,"¹ and in declaring that—

"Where women walk in public processions in the streets, the same
as the men;
Where they enter the public assembly and take places the same
as the men;
Where the city of the faithfulest friends stands;
Where the city of the cleanliness of the sexes stands;
Where the city of the healthiest fathers stands;
Where the city of the best-bodied mothers stands:
There the great city stands."²

The physiologist Huxley enjoins: "Emancipate girls. Whatever argument justifies a given education for all boys justifies its application to girls as well."³ Balzac points out that—"A woman who has received a masculine education possesses the most brilliant and useful qualities with which to secure the happiness of her husband and herself."⁴ Alexandre Dumas *filz* declares that the laws for the restriction of woman "now appear as acts of injustice and barbarism."⁵ With a worthy indignation, John Ruskin rebukes a petty cynicism:

"The noble passions are not merely disbelieved, but even the conception of them seems ludicrous to the impotent churl mind; so that . . . because I have honoured all women with solemn worship, therefore the hacks of English art and literature wag their heads at me, and the poor wretch who pawns the dirty linen of his soul daily for a bottle of sour wine and a cigar talks of 'the effeminate sentimentality of Ruskin.'"

In a further direction, confirming himself with other honoured observers, Ruskin tells how Shakespeare represents women as "infallibly faithful and wise counsellors, incorruptibly just and pure examples, strong always to sanctify, even when they cannot save"; and how, in the works of Scott as in those of Shakespeare—"It is in all cases the woman who watches over, teaches, and guides the youth; it is never, by any chance, the youth who watches over or educates his mistress."⁶

Wordsworth records his deep indebtedness for mental culture to his own sister:

¹ *Leaves of Grass.*

² *Song of the Broad-Axe.*

³ *Lay Sermons. Emancipation, Black and White.*

⁴ *Physiologie du Mariage. Meditation XI.*

⁵ *Les Femmes qui Votent et les Femmes qui Tuent, p. 25.*

⁶ *Sesame and Lilies, pp. 131 et seq.*

"She gave me eyes, she gave me ears ;
And humble cares and delicate fears ;
A heart, the fountain of sweet tears ;
And love, and thought, and joy."¹

And he tells later, and still more fully :

"Where'er my footsteps turned,
Her voice was like a hidden bird that sang,
The thought of her was like a flash of light,
Or an unseen companionship, a breath
Or fragrance independent of the wind."²

Mill writes, in remembrance of his wife : "Were I but capable of interpreting to the world one-half the great thoughts and noble feelings which are buried in her grave, I should be the medium of a greater benefit to it than is ever likely to arise from anything that I can write unprompted and unassisted by her all but unrivalled wisdom."³ And again : "Were there even a few hearts and intellects like hers, this earth would already become the hoped-for heaven."⁴

Lowell speaks of one who by her mental grace had powerfully moulded and enlarged his whole character, and—

"Whose life to mine is an eternal law,
A piece of nature that can have no flaw,
A new and certain sunrise every day."⁵

In these men is not hyperbole ; they simply write of and by a light never known to the woman-reviling systems—a light that is the assurance of a coming and general higher humanity. Thus these very types of womanhood are, with woman's freer and fuller training, of ever increasing occurrence ; so that—in English-speaking countries, at any rate—an educated man of the present time has had an exceptional and but arid experience who has not known at least one soul of true woman to which in his heart of hearts he realised that somewhat of similar eulogium was due. Of countervailing benefit to either sex is this worthy sympathy and endeavour of the other. As an unwearying pioneer of humanity has recently written concerning the emancipation of her sex :

"In this movement it is cheering to remember many men have worked hand in hand with women. The existence of such natures is, in itself, a prophecy of a future wherein men will reap the fruit of more liberal institutions at least as fully as the women for whose sakes they have been sought and established. . . . The prospect is opened into a land of promise where men and women will find blossoming many a beautiful lost dream and faded illusion ; and find, too, things new and beautiful such as they never dreamt of."—Mrs. Mona Caird, *New Century Magazine*, October 1897.

¹ *The Sparrow's Nest.* ² *The Recluse.*

⁴ On the tombstone at Avignon.

³ Dedication of *On Liberty*.

⁵ *Sonnets*, x.

These and numberless like aspirations and utterances and acceptances, by souls masculine and feminine, are evidences of a dawning era of justice and comprehension between the severed halves of humanity; anguries of a manhood pure and a womanhood free; prognostics of the "organic period" of an equity and solidarity of the sexes, beyond the plan, the thoughts, or perhaps the very nature of the failing and fading religionisms. All high intellects, independent of nationality or sex, evince the noble insights, the higher presages, and give voice to them in poetry or prose or story. To Goethe's greatest poem is added its final lesson of undying hope, when, in his concluding picture of visioned human conditions beyond present language, and in singing how

"What yet is wordless
Here becomes done,"

there flashes forth the one glorious assurance of lasting and advancing good, that—

"The Womanly ever
Leads upward and on."¹

And side by side with the prophecy of Goethe stands the realised truth of Tennyson, that, in all the incidents and efforts of this our human history,

"The Woman's cause is Man's; they rise or sink
Together, dwarf'd or godlike, bond or free."²

Such belief as is declared by the foregoing cohort of thinkers, and any thought or action in accordance therewith, whether by man or by woman—that is Feminism.

ELLIS ETHELMER.

¹ Last four lines from *Faust*.

² *The Princess*, canto vii.

POLITICAL DISTURBANCES IN INDIA.

A FEW words from one who has served nearly thirty-six years in the Civil Service may tend to explain the causes of the present discontent in India, and the dangers it involves.

In order to understand this serious question, it is necessary to look back to the period of native rule. The State was the universal landlord. Although the hereditary right of occupancy was never interfered with, the agricultural classes had no right of property in the land. They were *adscripti glebæ*, and the only limit to the exactions of their feudal chiefs was the necessity of allowing them sufficient food to keep them alive till the next harvest. Even this limit was frequently overstepped.

The revenue was levied at the point of the sword, and it was a point of honour, with the villages of the more martial tribes, not to pay *anything* without a fight, in which a few of their men were killed. The greater the bloodshed the more honour they had with their neighbours, and the higher the sums paid for their daughters in marriage.

This state of anarchy was gradually reduced to order by the Survey Settlement Act. Each field was measured, mapped, and its rental fixed according to the productive powers of the land, proximity to markets, &c. Payments were provided for by instalments, which varied with each district, season, and crop; and in order to meet the case of harvests being early or late, the local officers were empowered to alter the dates of payments, to suit the necessities of the season.

This point is of some importance, because Sir William Wedderburn stated, in the House of Commons in the debate on the Budget, that one of the grievances of the ryot is the "harsh and rigid" rules for the collection of the revenue; the fact being that the rules are extremely flexible, and that only a small fraction of the revenue is collected by legal compulsion. An expenditure of eight millions sterling on remissions of revenue and famine relief works during the present year, does not indicate any harshness or want of sympathy with the sufferings of the people; nor is this an exceptional instance. Every year large sums are remitted from the land revenue, owing to unforeseen calamities of flood or drought. After

the famine of 1887 thirty-five lakhs of revenue were remitted in the South Mahratta country alone.

The immediate effect of the Survey Settlement was a very large reduction of the revenue. In many districts it amounted to 50 per cent., but the low rental gave such an impulse to agriculture, that every available acre of jungle or waste land was brought under cultivation, and the result was not merely a recovery of the revenue remitted, but a great increase on the previous rental. Land which had hitherto been quite unsalable now acquired a very high market value.

The increased revenue enabled Government to expend large sums on railways and communications generally.

Districts which had previously been inaccessible to cart traffic now exported large quantities of produce, which found a ready market at the nearest port or railway station. About the same time the American civil war raised the price of cotton from 3*d.* to 2*s.* and even 2*s.* 6*d.* per lb. Every class of the community became extremely prosperous, and with almost Celtic improvidence, they rushed into every form of extravagance. One instance is reported of a cultivator making the tyres of his cart wheels of silver.

The rural population of Western India was at this time in the same state of enthusiastic loyalty as that of the Punjab, when it rallied at the call of John Lawrence to the siege of Delhi. The generation that had suffered from the anarchy of native rule had not yet passed away, and the young men were still in happy ignorance of the plague of usurers and pleaders who were soon to devastate the country like a horde of Pindaris. This loyalty has been so alienated by injudicious legislation and petty interference in domestic affairs, that it is more than doubtful if, either in the Punjab or the Deccan, the people would now respond to a similar appeal.

From an early period of our rule Government had been recognised as the sole owner of all land that had not been granted in jagir, or otherwise alienated, but the Survey Settlement Act gave a full title of ownership to the occupants for the time being, subject only to the payment of a small rent charge, which may have varied from 4*d.* to 2*s.* 6*d.* per acre, according to the quality of the soil and facilities of disposing of the produce. Irrigated lands of course paid extra for water when supplied by Government. So long as the rent was paid; the occupant enjoyed all the rights of ownership. He could let, sell, or mortgage his land; he could irrigate it or improve it in any way, without paying any extra rent. Government at the same time relinquished the right of enhancing the rental for thirty years, and even then the owner was guaranteed that his own improvements should not be considered a ground for an increase of rental.

No one could have anticipated that the grant of these liberal terms would have had the disastrous results which followed. For security of tenure, a low rental, and the "magic of property" have ever been considered the essential elements of agricultural prosperity. The improvidence of the people, however, soon transferred their valuable lands to the Soukar (the "Gombeenman" of India).

A class of absentee landowners has thus been created, who rack-rent and evict their tenants in the most relentless manner. Disaffection and discontent in India may be traced to the operation of this measure, and others of a similar character elsewhere. They were conceived in a spirit of beneficent statesmanship, but have been converted into a curse to the rural population, and a national danger to British rule in India, for the evictions being carried out by the courts of law, all the odium of the measure falls upon Government.

Government was not left without warning of the impending dangers. Sir Charles Pritchard, Sir James Richey, Sir Theodore Hope, Mr. H. E. M. James (Commissioner in Sind), and many of the most experienced revenue officers, saw clearly the evil consequences that the Act was producing. They remonstrated, and entreated Government to interfere while there was still time, but in vain.

The attachment of the Indian peasantry to their ancestral holdings is well known. The worst native Government never ventured to violate this sentiment. *That*, has been left to the blundering altruism of the British Government. There is a popular proverb which is held to justify any amount of bloodshed. It is to the effect that even a coward will fight for "Zerd, Zan, Zamin" (gold, women, and land).

It is surely a very serious matter when the landowners of the country, who are also its fighting men, the very backbone of its prosperity, who probably pay ninety per cent. of the revenue, are deprived of their lands and reduced to the condition of day labourers.

In 1875 a crisis occurred in the Deccan; there were riots in many places, the houses of Soukars were attacked and burnt, a few were mutilated, and their bonds destroyed, the troops were called out, but, on the whole, the rioters behaved with great moderation.

Government at last realised the importance of the matter. In 1879 the Deccan Agriculturist Relief Act was passed, and a special officer was appointed to superintend its administration. The operation of the Act, however, was confined to four districts of the Deccan, a very invidious distinction, for the evil to be dealt with extended, more or less, to the whole of India.

Its object was to restrict the sale of immovable property in satisfaction of decrees of the Courts, and to enable the Courts to exercise an equitable jurisdiction in cases in which ignorant and improvident cultivators were concerned.

The operation of the Relief Act was most beneficial. The cost of litigation was reduced, the Conciliators appointed under the Act disposed of a large number of cases which would otherwise have come into court, and lands which had been hopelessly mortgaged have been released and restored to the owners created under the Survey Act.

It has been found, after nearly twenty years' experience, that the credit of the ryot has not been injured: he can command sufficient capital for agricultural purposes, there has been no failure of cultivation, but quite the contrary, and none of the serious consequences which were foretold have occurred.

Poona, being one of the districts that has had the benefit of the Relief Act, it will be asked, How does it happen to be the centre of disaffection at the present time?

The policy of the Government has for some years offered a premium to seditious disloyalty.

The class books taught in the schools and sold in the Government book depôts are found to contain almost as many false statements and deliberate perversions of history as those of the American schools, in which hostility to England is habitually inculcated. A *History of India*, by Rao Bahadur Mahiputram Rupram, Education Inspector, of which 30,000 copies were sold, described Olive as a "loocha" (blackguard), and the policy of Warren Hastings as "abhorrent."

One of the highest paid offices in the gift of the Government of Bombay was on two occasions given to very prominent members of a seditious association known as the Servajanik Sabha. Membership of this society and the expression of disloyal sentiments have not been considered a disqualification for high office. Gungadar Tilak was admitted to the Legislative Council after the publication of some of the seditious articles for which he has since been convicted. Such being the case, is any further answer required to the question, why Poona, the centre of Brahman influence, should be a very hotbed of sedition?

The ancient Hindoo system of caste provided an excellent code of moral law. It inculcated honesty, purity, truth, temperance, and contentment. These principles were taught by the priesthood, and the elders of the caste, excommunicated for any breach of its rules; but our system of education has undermined the authority of the Brahmins and their teaching, without supplying any higher rules of conduct.

The present political movement is a struggle on the part of the

Brahmans to regain their influence. They are striving to produce a religious revival, and to enlist fanaticism in their aid.

The late disturbances between the Hindoos and Mussulmans, which have broken out repeatedly in every part of India, usually about the slaughter of cows or the desecration of temples, afford unmistakable evidence of the strength of the feeling the Brahmans have created, and the large number of killed and wounded on both sides shows that the rioters are thoroughly in earnest.

The numerous anti-cow-killing societies, which have sprung up in all directions, are another very significant symptom of religious fanaticism. These societies are affiliated with the Servajanik Sabha, in the proceedings of which all the higher native officials take an active part. The danger signals would be less urgent if there had not been of late years a general relaxation of the powers of Government, a sort of creeping paralysis, which is fatal to a vigorous administration.

The feeble action of the courts of law is well illustrated in the recent judgment of the High Court of Bombay.

This Court had, in September last, sentenced one Gungadur Tilak to eighteen months' imprisonment for a seditious publication in his newspaper.

This act of vigour appears to have exhausted all the energy of the Court; for when, a month later, an appeal from the justly severe sentences of Mr. Aston, the able judge of Sattara, came before it, the Court reduced the sentence on one convict, for identically the same offence, from transportation for life to imprisonment for one year; and in another case, from transportation for seven years to imprisonment for three months, remarking in the latter case that, though the convict was cognisant of the more important matter in his newspaper, his offence was rather that of negligence than criminality. That is to say, the Court places sedition in the same category as petty theft, and punishes a first offence with three months' imprisonment.

This judgment recalls the verdict of an Irish jury, "Not guilty; but don't do it again."

Cum nocens absolvitur, Judex damnatur.

An inadequate sentence for a crime which a more virile administration would punish with death, is but a small evil compared to the contempt which these eccentricities bring on the courts of justice, and the support they give to the absurd popular belief that they are the result of corrupt influence.

The judges are of course above all suspicion of corruption; but when large payments to subordinates in Bombay are frequently followed by remissions of sentence or acquittals of notoriously guilty convicts, the intelligent native draws his own conclusions.

The similarity between the social condition of Russia and that of

India has often been observed. Sir Donald Mackenzie Wallace (in his book on "Russia") shows how the late Emperor Nicholas, when he emancipated the serfs, endeavoured to establish a system of village self-government under a Starosta, in which the local gentry were forbidden to take any part; he failed, for the people were not sufficiently advanced in civilisation to assimilate free institutions, and the philanthropic intentions of the Emperor were frustrated.

Undeterred by the result of this very instructive experiment, the Government of India have for some years been forcing democratic municipalities on India, as a means of educating the people in self-government. The people vehemently protest that they do not want "Slaff" (Self), as they call it, for they see that it means taxation; but they are told that they do not know what is good for them.

Where they have been actively supervised by the European officers, the municipalities have done good work; but scattered as they are all over the country, it is impossible for the civil officers to control them. They have fallen into the hands of the Brahman leaders of the Servajanik Sabha, and, as in Russia, where the Emperor's experiment resulted in Nihilism, so in India, the municipalities have become centres of sedition, speculation, and waste.

In the Bombay Presidency alone, the municipalities spend nearly a million annually, the greater part of which is paid by the poorer classes.

The latest development of this folly is the admission of elective members to the Legislative Council. The elections are, of course, controlled by the Brahman wire pullers, who elected Gungadar Tilak to the Legislative Council of Bombay.

There is less cordial intercourse between Europeans and natives than formerly. The depreciation of silver has made it difficult for European officials to associate with native chiefs and gentlemen on equal terms, and the native Press has widened the breach by habitual calumny.

In order to understand the mischief done by the native Press, it should be looked upon from the native point of view. Government officials of the highest rank are accused of every form of criminality, and day by day held up to public execration. The authors of these calumnies not merely escape with impunity, they are admitted to the receptions at Government House, treated with favour and consideration, and are finally accepted as colleagues of the Governor himself in the Legislative Council.

The only inference an intelligent native can draw from this state of affairs is that the charges are true, and that the Government are powerless to suppress them. The "safety-valve" theory of the abuses of the Press has always been a fallacy, the refuge of timid and incompetent men to evade a disagreeable duty. The Poona murders might be extenuated on the same grounds. If the publication of a

sedition article relieves the feelings of a Brahman editor, the murder of a high Government official must have an exquisitely soothing effect.

But there are other dangers which are even more immediately urgent.

The Ameer of Kabul has been allowed to establish an arsenal and ordnance factories under skilled European supervision, where guns and arms of precision of the most approved pattern are manufactured in large quantities. The Afghans are the most treacherous race in Asia. It is absolutely certain that these arms are now being used against us. A recent telegram states that, having re-armed his troops with breech-loading rifles, the Ameer was selling his old rifles, for Rs. 2 each, to the turbulent tribes on our frontiers who are now in arms.

The inefficient state of the British army is now admitted by the Commander-in-chief. In India the disparity between the European and native element in the civil and military administration is a main factor of inefficiency and danger, and it becomes still more alarming when the superior training of the natives in the use of their arms is considered. The official returns show that in some native regiments the men shoot better than the European troops.

After the Mutiny a Royal Commission on the reorganisation of the army was appointed. All the talent and all the experience of the service, civil and military, was consulted, and after mature consideration the Commission recommended :

(a) That the proportion of native troops to Europeans in the cavalry and infantry should never exceed two to one in Bengal, and three to one in Madras and Bombay.

(b) That the artillery should be mainly a European force.

(c) That the military police corps, being an element of future danger, care should be taken *not* to give them a military training, beyond what was required to maintain discipline.

(d) That the native army should be composed of different nationalities and castes, as a general rule, mixed up promiscuously in each regiment.

(e) That the native army should be organised on a "Regular" footing.

(f) That the efficiency of the native army was injuriously affected by the small numbers of European officers attached to it, and that they should be increased to the full standard of a "Regular" organisation.

Though they were very distinctly written in blood, we appear to have quite forgotten the stern lessons of the Mutiny, and the solemn warnings of the experienced men who sat on the Royal Commission, for we have violated all but one of the cardinal principles laid down by them.

The native army has been augmented, so that its proportion to the British troops largely exceeds that prescribed as the limit of safety by the Royal Commission. A feeble attempt to reduce this disparity was made in 1885, but it was only partially effective, and the recent levy of Imperial troops has again dangerously increased the proportion of natives to Europeans.

The artillery is the only arm in which the advice of the Royal Commission has not been entirely set aside. It is still *mainly* a European force, but there are no fewer than four Native Field Batteries, one Native Garrison Battery, eight Native Mountain Batteries, besides nine companies of Native Garrison Artillery, recruited from the warlike tribes of India, who will supply skilled gunners to the Ameer of Kabul, or any hostile native power, on very short notice.

The military police have been not only increased in strength, but they have been given a perfect military organisation and modern arms of precision, while the native chiefs have been encouraged to recruit a large body, about twenty thousand men, armed with Martini-Henry rifles. They are called Imperial troops.

They are without European officers, and must constitute a very grave political danger. Any one with the least experience of the working of a native Durbar cannot fail to realise what a centre of intrigue such a force must become.

We had a very instructive object lesson in the conduct of H. H. Sindia's army in the Mutiny.

Instead of the native army being composed of mixed nationalities and castes in each regiment, class regiments or class companies of Sikhs, Goorkhas, Pathans, Beloochis, &c. &c., have been formed, as if the very object of the organisation were to afford facilities for mutinous combination; and at the same time making it very hazardous to employ them in operations against the warlike tribes from which they have been recruited.

The recent proclamation of the Government of India which exempts Afridi regiments from service against their brethren in the Tirah Valley, gives great importance to this danger.

The official publication of this exemption must surely have been inspired by the dementia which the Almighty inflicts on those He is about to destroy: for it strikes at the very root of the discipline and efficiency of the native army.

It officially announces the principle that the Afridis are not expected to serve against their co-religionists; and Sikhs, Goorkhas, Beloochis, Porbias, and Mahrattas will not hesitate to claim a similar exemption, though all of them have hitherto shed the blood of their brethren without the least compunction. If the Afridis were not to be trusted, they might have been kept to the rear, without establishing a precedent so injurious to military discipline.

The Regular organisation of the native army has been abandoned for the Irregular system, *i.e.*, the European officers are reduced to eight, in defiance of the repeated warnings of the most experienced officers. If a European regiment requires twenty-six officers to lead it into action, how is it possible that a native regiment can be efficient with only eight officers, some of whom must be absent on leave, some sick, and some expended, in the wear and tear of life incident to service in the field? The military operations now in progress in the Tirah Valley will deal, it is to be hoped, a death-blow to this instance of official imbecility.

It has been said that the sanitary measures for the suppression of the plague were the immediate cause of the Poona murders. This is very probably true. It is impossible for an inexperienced European officer, however patient and considerate he may be, to realise the intensity of religious feeling in India.

In every native house there is a Shrine in which the household gods are placed, like the Ikon in a Russian house. The very shadow of a European or native of a different caste passing over these or the culinary utensils of the family, is a defilement; but the use of malodorous disinfectants is, in the belief of the people, an outrageous desecration, calculated to call down on the family the wrath of the gods, and only to be atoned by rigid *pryaschit* (penance) and the administration of the *panch gaviya* (a foul pill composed of the five products of the cow). This outrage to religious prejudice is well calculated to become the "greased cartridge" of another mutiny, and though it is satisfactory to observe that the Bombay Government has not been deterred by the murders from enforcing sanitary measures, it is very doubtful if they have any effect in arresting the spread of the plague.

It is unfortunately true that the attempts to enforce sanitary measures unsuited to the habits of the people have for many years given rise to much petty oppression. In the endeavour of the people to evade the worry of the police, they have been forced into habits far more insanitary than those condemned by hygienic experts, and quite sufficient to account for the great increase of enteric fever, which has been so fatal of late years. It is possible that the recrudescence of the plague in Poona and Bombay may be traced to this cause; if so, this disease must become chronic in India.

A tendency to interfere in the domestic and social affairs of the people is another ground of alarm and discontent.

The encouragement given to the re-marriage of Hindoo widows is a late instance of this spirit of interference, and only the other day a very active agitation was got up by a party of amiable philanthropists to prohibit so-called infant marriages, but which are in fact mere betrothals. Great pressure was put on the Government of

India to pass a prohibitory Act, and provision was made in the Penal Code to restrict the right of a husband to consummate his marriage.

The subject is very little understood by Europeans, and is rather a delicate one to treat in the pages of a Review. It is sufficient to say that any attempt to enforce the provisions of the Code would produce an outburst of religious fanaticism of which it is impossible to see the end. The agitation was got up by a few benevolent busybodies, who, not finding the atrocities committed on women and children at their very doors sufficiently sensational, determined to extend their mischievous operations to India.

The so-called reform never secured the real support of even the reformers.

Mr. Kesow Chandar Sen, the founder of the Brahmo Samaj, persuaded the Government of India to pass an Act (applicable to members of that Society) restricting the age of marriage to thirteen years, though he himself allowed the marriage of his own infant daughter, and Mr. Kasinath Trimbak Telang, late Judge of the High Court of Bombay, who took an active part in the movement, did the same. The Afridis and Pathan tribes have a special grievance, "*Cherchez la femme.*"

Owing to the hard life they lead and the habitual use of the knife on the least suspicion of "levity," there has always been a great disparity of the sexes; but of late years the British Government and the Ameer of Kabul have put a stop to the capture of women on both sides of the frontier, and the extension of the railway to Peshawar has afforded great facilities for the escape of women who are, in fact, "fugitive slaves," many of them British subjects. It will be remembered that the Afridis, early in the war, offered to lay down their arms if we would restore their women. The war is, in fact, a war for the recovery of fugitive slaves.

The violent abuse of the Sultan by responsible politicians and the success of the Turkish army in Greece, may have revived the Mus-ulman hatred and contempt for the Ferringi Kafir.

The Sultan probably did send emissaries to preach the "*Jahad*" in India; but so long as we deprive the ryot of his land, violate the privacy of the Zanan khana (female apartments), and the sanctity of the Shrine, ignore the teachings of past experience, and vexatiously interfere in the most delicate domestic affairs of the people, we shall not require the Röntgen rays to discover the cause of seditious discontent.

LIONEL ASHBURNER.

ARE NATIONAL HOME INTERESTS WORTH TAKING CARE OF AND CULTIVATING ?

To answer this question fully it is necessary to compare the benefits to be derived by any nation from the different large departments into which trade is necessarily divided, which are :

1. Home Trade in Home Productions.
2. Import Trade.
3. Export Trade.
4. Through Trade from one country to another passing through a third.

The advantages of the first are :

(a) That the market is the nearest and the best known to the traders.

(b) That there is no waste of energy, time, capital, or damage on the way by sending to markets farther off.

(c) That the trade gives employment to the people, and thus tends to keep them happy and contented ; it also tends to keep their faculties, mental and physical, in good order. It tends to keep the people from speculation, and generally from evil courses ; it prevents the necessity for emigration, unless over-crowded, which is a point which has so far been seldom, if ever, reached—that is, for any country to be crowded all through ; and that all or nearly all the natural resources of either the country in question or the people have been brought out.

(d). As regards foreign nations, it makes any nation more independent of others, more self-reliant, more patriotic, and much more likely to progress, both as individuals and as a nation.

2. *Import Trade.* If what I have stated as to the benefits to be derived from cultivating home trade in home productions is correct, then the imports required, and the only ones which it is good to encourage are :

(a) Supplemental supplies of any articles which from any justifiable cause cannot be produced at home in sufficient quantities or as good as can be produced by other nations ; or (b) which cannot be reasonably produced at home at all.

Anything more than this implies something wrong in the home industries, and therefore is productive of decadence.

It must be manifest that the employment given by imports, except of articles for manufacturing purposes, is in comparison much smaller than that given by home industries.

3. *Export Trade* is good, if natural, not speculative—that is, gambling—and that the object is to supply good and suitable articles. Of course the manufacture of poor, unsatisfactory articles tends to lower any nation's character.

If either import or export trades have special advantages given them, it disarranges trade, and in some way or other produces harm, such as, for instance, drawing off the people by artificial means from supplying their own nation's wants by home industries.

So long as neither special advantages are given or disadvantages laid upon these trades, they may be safely left to take care of themselves, except so far as any impositions, deceit, or robberies are concerned.

4. Through trade gives so little employment and is comparatively of such small importance, it need not be further alluded to than to say, that it ought not, and there is no good reason why it should, have special advantages—and to do so is always playing with double-edged knives.

Clearly, the only trade to cultivate specially by any nation is its home trade in home productions. How? By the nation seeing on its own account and through its rulers that every reasonable opportunity and means are given to the people generally to understand and practise their occupations in the best way and under the best and most favourable circumstances known; by seeing that all means of communication are kept in the best working order at the lowest reasonable rates, that the nation is supplied with ample markets, and any other means of supplying themselves, governed by and for the people, so that each man and woman may have a personal interest in what is going on, and feel responsible for a satisfactory state of things. All these truths are so self-evident that it might well be asked, What justification can there be for bringing them prominently forward? . . .

The justification is that for the last sixty to seventy years import and export trades have been specially favoured, and home trade in home industries has been specially loaded with heavy disadvantages; that very little attention, in the interests of the people, has been bestowed upon markets; that the railroads have not been so managed as to give the greatest reasonable facilities for this trade, or for personal locomotion, but something like the least. That the canals and rivers which are most valuable for agricultural purposes, heavy and other traffic, have been allowed to silt up, or be filled up entirely; they have for the most part not been kept in working order, and

certainly not adapted, as they certainly should have been, to modern means of locomotion. This is the more to be regretted as there is ample traffic for both railways and canals; and owing to the influence and apathy of landed proprietors throughout the United Kingdom there is a very great dearth of house accommodation for workmen, and what there is, to a very large extent, is grievously inferior and unsuitable. This is so much so that it seems to be not uncommon for men not to be able to take work because there is no house accommodation to be had.

It is well to look back at something like the state of things before the beginning of the nineteenth century.

In some respects there was a stronger feeling in favour of home industries than latterly. The City Guilds prove this. But the roads were partly private investments, and no special endeavours were made that the means of communication should be the best which could be brought about.

It was thought best to place duties and other restrictions upon imports, partly for the purpose of revenue, and partly because up to that time it was thought that home industries ought not to be allowed to be destroyed by foreign competition; at the same time little attempt was made to see that the people generally were placed under the best conditions to produce necessary supplies for the nation. Hence deficiencies in supplies, low wages, notwithstanding that there was really ample work for all, and the necessary results, starvation, discontent, and disturbance.

The Chartists and others saw that the people had not sufficient or proper control over public affairs.

Afterwards, what is called Free Trade, but which only referred to import and export trades, was brought about by Messrs. Cobden, Bright, Villiers, and others; at the same time the enormous powers of steam, and afterwards of electricity, were brought into use, which, being linked with the ideas of making import and export trades free from artificial restrictions, the energies of the nation were at once devoted to these trades, and home trade in home productions was left out in the cold.

So much so, that even now in the daily papers the supply of home wants by home industries is seldom alluded to, and when it is, often with cynical remarks that we are beaten in the race by foreigners, and that it does not matter supplying our own wants by our own industries as far as we can reasonably do so; that cheapness of provisions goes before either their goodness or that the people should be employed. If they cannot find employment—if they cannot do so while labouring under such very great disadvantages, let the people emigrate; we have plenty invested abroad, and can do with little or no home agriculture or home manufactures: import and export trades are everything, &c. &c.

The immense impetus given to import and export trades by steam and the large number of persons who get their incomes from abroad, and the large amount of export trade in manufactures, have given something like encouragement to these ideas, and hidden largely the real state of things.

But it may well be asked whether any nation which is not supplying its own wants by its own industries so far as it can reasonably do so, is not destroying its own backbone. We have had before us a startling example in Ireland for more than 700 years. Every attempt which has been made to establish industries in Ireland upon any fair basis, such as those of Malcomson Brothers, of Portlaw, and now under co-operation, have apparently succeeded; and if Irishmen leave Ireland they succeed; also English settlers in Ireland, as Mr. Gladstone has pointed out, do not succeed any better after a time than the native Irish; and England and Scotland are rapidly getting into the same state from the same cause—that the supply of home wants by home industries has been and is under a ban.

It must be evident that just as home industries are destroyed the monetary and practical means of gaining knowledge and experience in any nation are also diminished. This is now occurring with the British nation.

Any population in any country gets its living by agriculture, breeding and selling cattle, &c., manufactures, teaching, all the necessary work of government, &c. &c.

If the ports are left open for trade, as the population increases this increase always proportionally increases the means of subsistence.

The only limit to population is deficiency of reasonable space, which probably has never been reached anywhere as a necessity. Hence, when poverty and trouble come upon a nation it always arises from bad government in some way.

The British bad government mainly consists in thinking more of external than internal matters; and in handing over to private persons the natural national income from the rent of land and from national enterprises which require land to carry them out. Yet our law does not admit that land is private property, though, strangely and inconsistently, it allows it to be treated as such.

It is common to hear persons say that we cannot from our own land supply all we want: that may be so; but they go on to argue that if so, then any destruction or unfairness to our home industries is justifiable. But this does not follow at all.

If these views are true, then what ought to be the rotation in importance as regards the deliberation and action of the rulers of this or any nation?

1. Home prosperity, and progress in every way, as a nation, not the prosperity of the rich only and the poverty and degradation of

the majority, which means ultimately the degradation and poverty of all.

2. The prosperity of any dependencies. In the British case, as the colonies are now fortunately self-governing, have got Home Rule, India should be the second point of interest.

3. As to our relations with other nations. The greatest safety and most profitable arrangements are plainly those of commerce, intercommunication, and mutual respect.

4. As to extension of dominion. Clearly the first rule ought to be not to extend till we can govern what we have, decently at any rate.

What, then, has been the rotation of importance generally adopted by our legislators?

1. Size of territory.

2. As regards foreign nations, warlike preparations, frequently of a very inefficient character, instead of friendly relations chiefly.

3. Home industries, home preparedness, home trade in home productions have been mainly left out in the cold, and import and export trade substituted.

The great reform necessary is to invert this order of things completely; otherwise the British nation, apart from its colonies and dependences, is bound to fall, just as other nations have done from the same and similar causes.

It is said, Look how prosperous we are. The income of the nation is constantly increasing. Trade also constantly increases—that is import and export trade; but it is stated, and I expect truly, that more than half of the income of the nation is derived, directly or indirectly, from investments abroad. If so, then more than half of it is not to be depended on, because it is only dependent on the nation so far as it is artificially supported by preferential rates over our railways—an arrangement which plainly means, as in Ireland, sooner or later, ruin to the nation and no dividend from the railways. It is not only possible, but quite likely, that a large portion of foreign and colonial investors may leave the United Kingdom just as the landlords left Ireland. Will there *then* be an appearance of so much prosperity? The United Kingdom is even now at their mercy, or subject to their inclination for the time being, and, whatever may be said about our prosperity, at least three-fourths of the people have an extreme and unnatural struggle to keep their footing. This now affects, and is admitted to affect, the landed interests. Looking beneath the surface, it is clear, therefore, that we are in a shaky condition, and are constantly, so far as legislation is concerned, in the main making it more shaky.

It is said that the low rates of interest mean plenty of money. There is such a thing as congestion of the human frame, which means stagnation in some part, either from some injury or because

the constitution is enfeebled. And it is just the same with this case of plenty of money. The preferences allowed on the railways for the last sixty or seventy years unfairly in favour of imports and exports have enfeebled the nation by largely destroying home industries; and also little attention has been paid, notwithstanding and excepting the Board schools, local government, and private endeavours, in preparing the nation to do its work in the best way. Hence capital has got to be congested in guaranteed shares and stocks of all descriptions and wild speculations. These have gone up to artificially excessive prices, and, owing to the dearth of home investments, there still is a large amount of money seeking employment.

This congestion is looked upon by most persons, including all, or nearly all, the daily press, as a sign of robust health. I say it is a dangerous sign of apoplexy. Increased imports are also looked upon as a sign of health. To my thinking they are a sign of something grievously wrong, especially coupled with the decadence of agriculture and manufactures. It shows that imports are *supplanting*, not merely *supplementing*, our own productions.

It should also be borne in mind that, as each nation adopts machinery and becomes equal to others, trade between nations will have a tendency to decrease, except to supplement and supply articles which one nation is more capable of producing than another.

How is it that other nations supply us with a vast amount of their productions, which it would be (as I have shown, and as is generally admitted) very much more advantageous for our own people to produce?"

Simply because those nations and their Governments look after their home industries more than we do. They also get favourable rates over their railways, and still more favourable rates over our railways, as well as in some cases being paid bounties on exportation by their own Governments.

Again, it is supposed that the railway directors have done the best, or something like it, for the nation, and, at any rate, for the shareholders. What are the real facts?

Beyond Parliament making for each railway a most complicated and various mode of charging, which has been constantly departed from, and also much increased in complexity and impracticability, no check, or next to none, has been imposed on the directors in the interests of the nation.

The first genuine, and almost only, efficient attempt in this direction has been the heavy damages given in law courts for accidents to passengers. This has been the chief means of keeping the railways in decent working order. Even now there is a constant fight going on as to adopting reasonable precautions for the safety of their workpeople.

Now, as to the shareholders. When a ship-broker loads, say, a 5000 ton ship, if there is plenty of freight to be had, he makes his rates for all at least paying ones, and, at any rate, generally charges all shippers the same rate. If their happens to be a small amount of freight in the market, he reduces his rate, and, for the purpose of securing any large lot, will reduce considerably.

The railway directors have always been in the first position and never in any other, they could and can get any quantity of freight they can carry *if they do not charge prohibitive rates*, either of home or foreign produce, yet for half to three-quarters of their traffic they charge low, and a great deal of it *very* low, rates, namely, for import, export, and favoured persons, and for home trade in home productions high rates, to a large extent so high as to be prohibitive, and then having destroyed or not cultivated the home trade in home productions, they turn round at Parliamentary and other inquiries and legal actions and say, Why, you have not got any trade, hence we are obliged to cultivate imports and exports.

To take imports, &c., much lower than necessary or reasonable, and to kill or severely damage home trade in home productions, the only reliable and permanent trade, cannot possibly be in the interests of the shareholders.

Taking into account the enormous expansion of import and export trades through steam and electricity during the last sixty years, it would have been a hard matter for the railway directors to kill the railways and the nation entirely, but they have done nearly as much as they could in this direction, and any dividends or prosperity are not on account of, but in spite of, their suicidal actions.

On June 16, 1896, R. Price Williams, M.Inst.C.E., read an essay before the Royal Statistical Society, Sir Courtenay-Boyle, K.C.B., Vice-President, in the chair. Among other statements he made were the following: "The gross goods traffic receipts on the London and North-Western Railway for 1894 were £4,160,131, or just 36½ per cent. of the entire revenue of that railway, being respectively £2075 per mile, 8s. 9d. per train mile, and 0.8759d. per ton per mile, with an average net load of 120 tons." *These receipts, it should be noticed, include the station and service terminal charges at both ends.* As the station and service terminals are seldom if ever charged on import or exports, and that the rates for home productions for home consumption are not only high, but that they are charged for terminals and service charges as well, it proves how excessively low must be the rates charged on imports. Again, he said, the London and North-Western Company is allowed to charge on the seven higher classes of merchandise for not exceeding 150 miles, 1.79d. per ton per mile, whereas the company only receive gross an average of 0.88d. per ton per mile and net 0.44d. per ton per

mile. It therefore seems to be evident that the railways on an average do not receive a penny per ton per mile gross and not a halfpenny per ton per mile net. The railway directors have so far kept as a secret how they make up their through rates, and when they do give an analysis, the particulars are so various, even for the same charge, that no reliance ought to be placed on such information. As the *average* receipts from the railway goods traffic is under one penny per ton per mile, and the charges for home trade in home productions range from one penny to sixpence per ton per mile, it is hardly possible that the charge for imports can be more than, even, if as much as, one farthing per ton per mile.

It is therefore quite clear that if there were a uniform charge of one penny per ton per mile all round at weight and measurement, the same as when shipping abroad, the following would result:

Home trade in home productions would get a fair chance, which would cause—

(a) Home trade to go up in a way it has never done before, and there would be universal employment.

(b) Land and houses would become of their natural value.

(c) This prosperity would not be of the speculative character because speculation—that is, chance caused by uncertainty of knowledge, is chiefly confined to import and export trades, mining, horse racing, card playing, and bubble companies.

(d) The nation would altogether become healthier and stronger.

(e) Capital would no longer be congested.

I have not dealt with the question of passenger traffic, which has been treated in ways equally adverse to the interests of the nation and of the shareholders.

I hope I have made it clear that the case could hardly be stronger than that we ought to turn over a new leaf as soon as possible as to our home interests, that is, our most important interests, and that the matter is very urgent.

To sum up as to railways. It should be borne in mind that the power of steam is a new experience of over sixty years.

That, as a matter of course, such an enormous power is capable of being used to the immense benefit of humanity, and it can also be misused to the very great detriment of any nation.

As a matter of fact, it has been greatly misused in conjunction with private ownership of land and other ways. In no way has it been so much abused as by the power it has given to railway directors over the trade of the United Kingdom, and hence over the happiness, prosperity, and even lives of the community. Hence our agriculture is to a large extent dead or dying, so is our engineering, iron and cotton trades, and manufactures of all sorts, so far as home consumption is concerned. And as a consequence occupations such as the profes-

sions, shopkeeping, clerks, &c., are overcrowded, and there is a most unhealthy, artificial, and unfair competition.

No hope can be expected from the action of the great majority of railway directors; the whole subject seems to be beyond them, or not to interest them.

Mr. Gladstone passed an Act in 1844 (I am informed), still in force, for taking over all the railways at three months' notice, paying for them (by Government Stock) twenty-five years' purchase on an average of the net receipts of the three previous years. These terms might have to be made higher, as railway stocks have gone up so much.

There is no serious difficulty about this, as the present staffs of the railways are ready for the most part and would be glad of the change.

There would also be a large additional income to the nation in reduction of taxation, because the railways have not produced anything like what they are capable of.

This should be done without any delay, or most serious results, such as have only been experienced to a very large extent in Ireland, must result sooner or later.

N. M. TAYLER.

TRADES UNION TACTICS IN RELATION TO LAW AND ORDER.

THE COLLIERY STRIKES OF 1892 AND 1893.

THE following paper was chiefly written immediately after the events on which its conclusions are based, but the failing strength of advancing years prevented its being put into a form fit for publication. Recent events have fully confirmed all that the writer had expressed, and proved afresh with strong evidence the need for his views being placed before the thinking public. The extensive and disastrous cotton strike in Lancashire, the colliery strike in Scotland, the shoemakers' strike at Leicester, and now the engineers' strike on the Clyde and at Belfast, and still more recently the North-Eastern Railway strike, all strongly emphasise the writer's contention, and strongly suggest the necessity for some decided action being taken to arrest these lawless endeavours of trades unions to establish a monopoly of labour, ruinous alike to their employers and to the commerce of the country.

The engineers' strike, which is now raging, will, when its history comes to be written, prove an ample confirmation of the views expressed in this paper. The extended federations, the help given by other trades, and the morbid sympathy and practical aid afforded by a certain portion of the outside public in prolonging the struggle, render the crisis most formidable. Success to the trades unionists in such a contest would be a far-reaching and appalling calamity and a most formidable blow to the progress of society.

The writer makes no apology for presenting this article as he wrote it at the time. He is certain that the state of things which it reveals will prove very startling to those who have not hitherto given careful attention to the subject. It is scarcely to be believed that events like those here narrated could have transpired in an order-loving, law-abiding country like ours. It is still more astonishing that those who are responsible for the due execution of the laws for the protection of life, person, and property should have stood by to see the laws defied in that wholesale manner, and rarely lifted a finger to punish one of the many deeds of violence as it deserved. It is more astonishing still to see the way in which the leaders of

various religious denominations have extended their sympathy and their patronage, and how even the Government has shown its sympathy with the breakers of the law, as when, in the Leicester strike, the magistrates did go so far as to imprison two men for acts of violence and intimidation towards a non-unionist, the Home Secretary, on hearing of the case, immediately sent down orders to set the men at liberty. Extremes beget extremes. The working classes were once oppressed and treated with injustice which could not be too strongly condemned. But the tendency is now all the other way. We are witnessing the effects of democracy run wild, and our rulers will have to be very careful if they do not intend to hand the country over entirely to the tender mercies of the mob.

The way in which trades unions have been allowed with absolute impunity to damage or even ruin the commercial interests of their employers, corresponds with the morbid sympathy or cold indifference with which trades union action has been met in recent times. Every strike is a conspiracy to injure the employers, and the extent to which injury can be inflicted is the measure of the prospect of success. But such injury is criminal, and the law amply provides redress. Happily the capitalists are waking up to this truth, as illustrated by the following: "A special jury in the Queen's Bench Division has awarded damages amounting to £674 13s. to a firm of glass bevellers in London, who sued the executive of the Glass Bevellers' Union for stopping the works and picketing them in consequence of a trade dispute"—January 16, 1897. This is as it ought to be. Let all masters who are injured by illegal conspiracy in the form of strikes adopt this simple measure, and better methods will soon be found.

The colliery strike in the county of Durham in 1892 lasted three months, and it affected 60,000 miners. But its disastrous effects were not limited to the miners. The whole population was impoverished, and many tradesmen were ruined. One railway company alone lost £490,000, and many of the employes, engine-drivers, &c., who were temporarily dismissed, suffered, with their families, extreme hardships. It is impossible to estimate the losses of the colliery owners—the mischiefs of this strike having been aggravated by the unionists preventing the owners from continuing to pump water out of the pits, or keep machinery in repair. Sir George Elliot, who was himself once a pitman, bitterly lamented this feature of the strike of 1892. Having referred to one in which he took part in 1831, he says :

"But it never occurred to the men to stop the pumping engines, and thus wantonly destroy the property of their employers, and I am sorry that it has been reserved for me to see this moral deterioration in the men of the county in which I was born, and which I had the honour to represent in Parliament for nearly twenty years."

In the strike of 1893, affecting chiefly the collieries of Yorkshire and the Midlands, it is estimated that 340,000 miners were off work for four months; that they lost in wages £7,000,000, and that the owners lost at the lowest estimate an equal amount; while the damage done to railway companies and to other trades from the stoppage of coal supplies was beyond calculation. At the potteries 30,000 men were reported to be prevented from earning wages for many weeks. At Sheffield, nearly all the large works were standing still, and dire famine was to a large extent experienced. The factories of Lancashire were similarly affected; in many instances coal could not be obtained for making gas, and large populations were left in total darkness, at the same time that the temporary rise in the price of coal rendered many concerns unprofitable, and caused immense loss to proprietors who were already finding it extremely difficult to keep afloat in the general trade depression which has been intensifying during the last few years. In short, the ramifications of mischief resulting from this disastrous strike it would be impossible to estimate. Much of our business with foreign lands has been transferred to other countries, never to be recovered. Twenty millions sterling would be a very moderate estimate for the loss inflicted on the country by this disastrous strike, and when taken in connection with the actual suffering endured, both by the pitmen and their families, and also by other families whose bread-winners were not parties to the dispute, this event must be regarded as a huge national calamity.

Many very important lessons have been drawn from these ruinous events; but the most important of all seems to have been entirely overlooked. There has been great sympathy exhibited towards the pitmen, both by other workmen and by a large section of the Press and of the religious public. But this sympathy has been very much misplaced. It has been contended that the pitmen were fighting not only the battle of their own class, but that of other working men whose masters are supposed to be unwilling to give them their due. The cry of "a living wage," too, has been made the most of by well-meaning people who, oblivious of the inexorable conditions of supply and demand and the exigencies of commerce, fondly imagine that a fixed minimum wage is within the range of possibility. Many attempts have been made to fasten upon the owners a large share of the responsibility of these ruinous proceedings. But their position from first to last was fair and open, and the grounds on which the men resisted all attempts at conciliation were wholly unreasonable.

But be this as it may, there remains an infinitely more important view of the subject, which, so far as the present writer's observation has gone, has been entirely lost sight of throughout the struggle. The fact is, the whole of the operations of trades unions on such

occasions are on an entirely wrong basis, and if they are not effectually prevented from proceeding on the same method in the future the worst possible results will follow. In short, their action in the conduct of a strike is, from first to last, a violation of some of the most sacred principles of social life and of the actual laws of the realm; and the permission of it by the Government is cultivating a spirit of lawlessness, and giving an opportunity for the extension of mob-rule, which, if not speedily checked, will give, in the near future, infinite trouble to those who are responsible for the good order of the nation and the protection of person and property.

These operations of trades unions violate two fundamental principles of society. In seeking to establish a monopoly of labour, they deprive their fellow-workmen of the sacred right of free contract, and they deliberately and with design inflict certain injury on the employer in order to deter him from exercising the same right. Injury thus inflicted is essentially criminal, and only a grossly perverted state of public opinion could render the permission of its perpetration possible.

Freedom of contract between employer and employed is a sacred right of mankind which ought to be most jealously guarded by every working man, but which, on the contrary, is utterly ignored by trades unions and their sympathisers. This right has been fully recognised in all recent legislation. When, in 1824, it was proposed to repeal the Combination Laws, it was distinctly laid down that

"it is absolutely necessary to enact such a law as may, efficiently and by summary process, punish either workmen or masters who, by threat, intimidation, or acts of violence, should interfere with the PERFECT FREEDOM which ought to be allowed to each party of employing his labour or capital in the manner he may deem most advantageous."

This principle was also fully recognised in the passing of the Law of Conspiracy, a law which, indeed, had special reference to the unwarrantable measures resorted to by trades unions. This law, as it now stands, provides that any one doing any of the undermentioned acts is guilty of conspiracy, and is liable to three months' imprisonment:

"1. Using violence or intimidation to any other person, his wife or children, or injuring his property.

"2. Persistently following such other person about from place to place.

"3. Watching or besetting the house or other place where such other person resides, or works, or carries on his business, or happens to be, or the approach to such house or place.

"4. Following such other person with two or more persons in a disorderly manner, in or through any street or road."

Now it is not saying too much to affirm that if this law had been carried out with reasonable promptitude and vigour from the commencement of the two strikes in question, they would have collapsed

in less than a fortnight. Indeed, no strike could ever be kept up to any purpose under such conditions, for it is notorious that there are always plenty of men to be found who would be ready to take the places of those on strike if left unmolested to follow their own judgment and inclination. The unionists delight to describe their action as "social war"; and they tell their members that they must be prepared to "put their hands in their pockets to FIGHT capital," and they rely entirely on these illegal measures to maintain the strife. It is, indeed, a war, its weapons are "threats, intimidation, and violence," and its authority mob-law. For the three months that the Durham strike lasted, the whole district was under mob-law. It is true that, from time to time, the leaders issued feeble injunctions to the men to keep to peaceable measures, but they knew full well that no notice would be taken of those injunctions; and they relied on the violent action of the mob all the same, knowing perfectly well that without it the strike would soon have been at an end.

A large share of the responsibility on these occasions devolved upon the magistrates, who, instead of promptly and vigorously enforcing the law from the first, contented themselves with drafting extra police into the district, and it may be military as well, not promptly to punish the thousands of men—yes, and women too—who formed the yelling, hooting, stone-throwing, furniture-breaking mobs, but simply to keep them at bay, so as to prevent their savage fury from doing its worst in the persecution of any luckless wight who, in vindication of his inherent right, ventured to go to work in opposition to the dictation of an organised mob. To have apprehended and punished as they deserved the one-hundredth part of the open breakers of the law would have been impossible. But if, from the first, the conspicuous leaders of each mob had been at once apprehended and imprisoned, the law would have been vindicated, the disgraceful scenes that followed would have been prevented, and the unions, finding their favourite method of settling trade disputes unavailing, would long ago have resorted to more reasonable methods.

Bearing in mind the provisions of the Conspiracy Law, let any unprejudiced person read the following details, culled from the accounts with which the Press abounded during the strike:

"Tin-canning and discordant cries took place at all places where the men look upon work as a breach of their union compact. Some exciting scenes were witnessed at Crook on Monday afternoon. The arrival of many miners from the surrounding villages seemed to point to something exceptional going to take place. It appears that a number of men are at work at the French ovens at Bank Foot, and being non-unionists, they decline to desist from work. It was evident that they thereby incurred the displeasure of the strikers. During the afternoon and evening hundreds of men, women, and boys, headed by a drum and kettle band, met each man as he came from work, and drummed him home. So excited became the crowds who congregated around the ovens that it became necessary to escort the workmen out by policemen, who were followed by men and

women playing upon gewgaws and tin pans. For a time Hope Street was quite blocked with people. No cases of violence are reported, but it is feared that if the workmen continue to follow their employment something serious may occur."

Again :

"At New Seaham there were disorderly scenes on Monday night, when a large crowd of nearly 1000 people—men, women, and children—paraded the village from street to street, howling, yelling, booing, and jeering at every one whom they thought unfavourable to the strike. The proceedings began about seven o'clock and continued till near midnight. The noise created by the shouting and beating on tins, trays, and other articles was very great. Houses were attacked with stones, and the windows smashed and doors damaged. Considerable damage was done to the furniture in the houses attacked by the crowd. Extra police have been drafted thither."

But nothing is said of any arrests out of the hundreds who were flagrantly breaking the law, and treating their fellow-workmen worse than wild beasts.

Again :

"A disturbance broke out at Hebburn Colliery on Tuesday, owing to some of the enginemmen continuing at their work. An elderly man named Gray was being conducted to his residence by several policemen, when a mob of between 200 and 300 followed them, hooting and throwing mud at them. His house was also stormed, the crowd throwing large missiles, which were handed from the railway, and completely smashing the windows and the shutters, which were closed for safety."

Again not a word about any arrests. And this in a country that boasts of its liberty and the law-abiding character of its citizens!

Again :

"Some extraordinary scenes took place at Westwood on Monday. A number of coal-fillers proceeded from Consett to fill coal from a large heap connected with the Westwood Colliery, for the purpose of having it conveyed to Consett to keep the ironworks in operation. A detachment of police from Consett accompanied the men, so as to protect them while getting the coals. Very soon after the men commenced work, under the superintendence of Mr. Teasdale, traffic manager, thousands of men, women, and children congregated together near the pit heap, and commenced to hoot the men who were filling the coals. Stones, mud, tin pots, and other missiles were thrown at the men and the police, and finally the men had to take refuge in a joiner's shop. The men, at last, had to take to their heels and run, with the large concourse of people after them. One of the workmen left his coat, hat, and scarf lying, which were seized by the crowd and set fire to. The fugitives eventually succeeded in reaching Ebchester Station, and the guard of the passenger train, seeing their predicament, ordered the train to stand until every man was safe in one of the compartments."

No arrests on this occasion. Mob-law triumphant. The working man's right of free contract ruthlessly trampled on by a lawless mob of his fellow-workmen. And this is the style in which the "apostles of labour" propose to emancipate the working men from the slavery of capital!

These are a few specimens of the way in which trades unions, with the help of the mob, fight the battle of labour. The effect was that the whole district soon settled down into a state of compulsory acquiescence in the dictation of the mob. Thus we read :

"Owing to the disturbance which took place on Tuesday when a number of deputies where returning home, they waited upon the manager at Black Prince Colliery, and desired to keep away from work until the strike is finished, and this course has been agreed upon."

And mob-law reigned supreme.

Take another illustration of the way in which both masters and men succumbed to the violence and intimidation of the mob, justifying the assertion that the whole district was, while the strike lasted, under mob-law :

"For the first day or two after the strike commenced there was some amount of disturbance at Castle Eden owing to the men taking exception to two of their number working for the masters; but this was soon set at rest by the coal-owner stopping the men, and since then everything has been perfectly orderly."

The leniency of the magistrates in the few cases brought before them must have greatly encouraged the mob in its lawless violence. In one case of attacking and damaging the house of a "blackleg" a fine of 1s. without costs was inflicted. In another, in which serious personal violence had been used, with threatening language, the magistrates "*thought the prosecution did not wish to treat the case SERIOUSLY,*" and they would THEREFORE fine the défendant 10s. and costs. In another case, five New Durham "putter-boys" were brought before the Durham county magistrates for assaulting a "blackleg" workman. In the afternoon a crowd of 200 howled and shouted outside the complainant's door for upwards of three hours, and when the man turned out to go to his work at Sherburn Colliery he was stoned and threatened by the angry crowd. He identified defendants as among those who threw stones at him. The lads were fined 1s. each and costs, the chairman adding that they "*did not wish to appear vindictive against the men, nor to do anything which would prejudice the lads in the eyes of the public*" ! Such leniency and such remarks are directly calculated to bring law and justice into contempt and to strengthen the tendency, already too rampant, to subject the county to the rule of the mob.

The leading features of the coal strike of 1893 correspond precisely with those of 1892. "Free fight at Dowlais"; "A reign of terror at Ebbw Vale"; "Bâton charge at Pontypridd"; "Military in readiness"; "A colliery wrecked by strikers"; "Riot Act read"; "The mob charged by mounted police"—such are a few of the headings of paragraphs of news throughout the strike. The following will serve as a specimen of the daily proceedings :

"Sept. 6th.—The passengers arriving at Barnsley by the noon trains to-

day report that the Wath Main Colliery, which is close to the Midland Railway, is being wrecked by the strikers. The lamp-room and offices have been broken into and the contents destroyed. The loaded railway waggons and the stacks of coal upon the premises have been set on fire and are burning fiercely."

And again :

"Yesterday afternoon alarming riots occurred at Hoyland and Silkstone and Rockingham Collieries, two of the largest pits in South Yorkshire, at both of which places serious depredations have been done. A large body of men, numbering from 1000 to 1200, marched in military fashion to the Hoyland and Silkstone Collieries, situated about five miles from Barnsley, where coal was being filled upon the pit-hill. The rioters attacked the colliery from four sides at one and the same time. A large number rushed on the pit bank, where twenty-five men were filling up coal, and made a fierce attack upon them. Some got away. Others were badly bruised. The men fled in all directions. Mr. Fincken, director and manager, happened to be in the office, and he attempted to speak to two or three, evidently the ringleaders. He tried to reason with them, saying that if they objected to coal being filled up he would discharge the men at once."

Here observe the same ready submission to mob dictation so conspicuous in the Durham strike. But even this would not pacify this excited band of English citizens !

"Mr. Fincken was attacked and struck on the head with sticks, and was kicked on the legs. Stones were thrown at him, and he had to retreat into the office. Instantly a large piece of iron was thrown through the office window, followed by a volley of stones. He again appealed to them, and was again attacked, but was ultimately rescued by his workmen. The mob then rushed into the office, seized the books, and tearing the leaves out threw them about the yard. The lower office was wrecked, and considerable damage was done to other parts of the premises. Mr. Fincken was got away, and the rioters then left, crossing the fields to Rockingham Colliery, belonging to Messrs. Newton, Chambers & Co. Arriving at Birdwell, they rushed upon the premises, where a number of men were engaged in filling coal. They attacked the men, who fled in all directions, some of them sustaining serious injuries. Stones were thrown, and the windows of the weigh office and other buildings were greatly damaged. By some unexplained means the depredators set fire to a number of coal waggons and to the coal heap."

The quotations made above are but a specimen of the lawless and destructive action by which these strikes have been maintained. And such measures are, in a greater or less degree, resorted to on all such occasions. It is true, as we have already observed, that the leaders of the unions make a show of discouraging such proceedings. In the example just quoted, we are informed that the men acted in opposition to advice given to them by Mr. Pickard and the other officials of the Yorkshire Miners' Association. But there is little satisfaction in this statement, for it implies that the leaders of the strike have no proper or efficient control of the forces that they bring into the field. It is a "tremendous battle," they tell us, that they are fighting with the owners. But if, in order to carry out their

design, it becomes necessary for the army to convert itself into a lawless mob, and the officials to lose all control of its actions, surely this fact alone is sufficient to condemn the whole system. If the leaders were made responsible, as they ought to be, for the actions of the forces they bring into the field, they would soon find out some more reasonable method of settling their trade disputes. It is simply monstrous that any body of men should have the power to disorganise manufactures and commerce throughout the land, subject the community of trade to incalculable losses, and the families of the labouring classes to sheer starvation, all to settle a dispute as to wages or any kindred question between them and their employers.

But further, even if no intimidation were used, the officers and leaders of the unions may very properly be held responsible for gross violations of the law of conspiracy. Their method of drawing off the whole of the men engaged by a given company inflicts a direct and often extensive injury on the firm—making it impossible for them to fulfil their contracts, or to continue the manufacture of the articles on which their profits depend. The losses of property caused by these means must be estimated by millions of pounds sterling, and they are inflicted for the express purpose of coercing the employers, and compelling them to submit to the demands of the union, without reference to their reasonableness or otherwise. Such interference is a crime of no mean magnitude, and ought to be punished as such. This action of trades unions has led to a corruption of public opinion which is most disastrous in its effects, and leads to the actual sanction of crime on a large scale, which, on a smaller scale, would not be tolerated for a single moment. If a single workman leaves his employer, his place can be filled by another without serious disturbance, if any, to the operations of the concern. But when, by previous agreement, all the men leave their work together, they necessarily inflict a real and most serious injury on the employer. And this is never done without means being taken to prevent other men from taking the places of those on strike. And it is notorious that without illegal methods of persuasion they never could prevent their places being supplied by others. The lengths to which the mobs have gone in the recent strikes fully demonstrate the entirely unjustifiable character of all attempts to settle trade disputes by this method. If the means used to prevent other workmen from taking the place of those on strike were simply those of persuasion, they would still, if successful, constitute a most unwarrantable interference with the right of the employer to use his capital in any way that suits him best. But it never stops here. To make strikes possible it has always been found necessary to deter other workmen, by unlawful means, from exercising their judgment and their right of free contract. They have been dubbed "blacklegs" and "rush-sticks," and treated as if they were great offenders against all law,

human and divine. They have been threatened, beaten, stoned, ducked in ponds, blown up with gunpowder, and subjected to inconceivable indignities and cruelties, often to the endangering and even to the destruction of their lives.¹ And this false standard of rights and duties has been upheld as virtue itself, and distinguished Church dignitaries have made great reputations by the championship of men whose action has been, from first to last, of the most lawless description.²

It is the more important that the leaders of the unions should be made really responsible for the action of the men in every strike that takes place, for it is they who indicate the course to be followed, and who initiate the arguments by which their advice is defended. A very large proportion of the men are too ignorant and too indifferent to all social questions to have any intelligent view of the situation. "We want our reets," was the remark of a Durham pitman in 1892 to a gentleman travelling in the district. "Well, and what are your rights?" "Weel, we deen't know; but we want 'em," was the sage reply. Too many of them are too fully occupied as dog-fanciers and pigeon-flyers, or with rabbit-coursing and pigeon-shooting matches, football and horse-racing, and too many arrive at conclusions under the bewildering influence of potations indulged in at the public-house, to make the votes of the majority a safe guide for the whole. If the sensible, moral portion of the pitmen could be singled out from the more excitable and ignorant and dissipated class, the vote would, doubtless, often be the reverse of what it actually is. And, at best, it is but a clumsy and unwieldy method of arriving at decisions of policy to leave them to the vote of all the members of bodies like the trades unions. After all, their course is directed and their decisions arrived at from the speeches and advice of their recognised leaders. Take the following from the speech of an alderman, a "miners' executive":

"The Federation Board were ready to fight the men's battles. The Federation circulars showed no dictation. In fact the Board had no power to act contrary to the wishes of the men, and he was there to declare that, whatever settlement was made, it must be an all-round settlement. The men had not attempted to 'blackleg' the owners as the latter had attempted to 'blackleg' the men. They had been stigmatised as hypocrites and devils, but all he asked was a just cause. The Board were sticking honest and true, and were trying to please no one, but were endeavouring to deal out justice and plain speech to all men. The reporters had also

¹ Take the following as a specimen: "A telegram from Hanley states that on Thursday morning between 400 and 500 Federation men marched in procession through the streets of Longton, North Staffordshire, to Weston Coyley Colliery, where it was reported that non-unionist men were at work. Half-a-dozen men who were found filling trucks were attacked with sticks and stones, and hastily left the pit-bank. A party of strikers then descended the shaft, and finding the flymen below, used them roughly. A non-unionist leader, named Birks, was pushed into the cage, hauled to the top and thrown into an adjoining pond, and after his immersion compelled to walk at the head of the strikers through the village of Adderley Green, being vigorously hooted all along the route."

Witness the coal-heavers' strike in London

struck; but they were only working men and not responsible for leading articles. *He wanted men to blackleg the policemen! Blackleg every man in the force, and do not give them a chance.*"

This closing advice was received with cheers. The federation of unions has largely increased the powers of mischief possessed by the unionists. But they are not content with the power already acquired. They propose to bring the whole country under the dominion of their monopoly. At an open-air meeting, attended by 7000 people, in the county of Durham, a resolution was moved and carried, advising "federation" with the Sailors' Union and the National Amalgamated Coal Porters, with a view to strengthen the labour combination. The speaker who moved the resolution said:

"The Federation Board of Miners was incomplete without the union of sailors as carriers, and of coal porters as distributors. The railway men, the miners, the sailors, and the coal porters ought to be federated, and *they could, at any time, block the coal trade of the port of London and of the country.*"

This is nothing less than the propounding of a gigantic conspiracy calculated to cause inconceivable mischief to business of every kind, and designed to inaugurate a tyranny of trades unionists over their non-unionist fellow-working men, over capitalists, and over the general community, more grinding far than ever was contemplated by the capitalists of five hundred years ago. In the same spirit, one of the most prominent "apostles of labour" during the strike so lately closed stated that it was only a preliminary movement, and gave the impression that something on a much wider scale and more effective was in contemplation.¹ It is very astonishing that this widespread conspiracy has been tolerated so long, and that attention has not been pointedly called to the unlawful and mischievous character of the whole system. Another of the "apostles of labour," speaking at a meeting in London, is reported to have said:

"It was the duty of every worker to show sympathy with the miners and their families who were now fighting the battle of labour (!). This strike had done more in the way of education than all the talk of centuries. *They had presented to them the lesson of the captains of labour paralysing the trade of the country, killing men, women, and children in order to reap greater gains.*"

And thus the attempt is continually being made to create a bad feeling between employers and employed. Lawless violence to persons and destruction of property follow as a matter of course. Even if no violence is employed, the leaders are guilty of conspiracy in deliberately injuring other people's trade.

And, beyond all this, it is monstrous that any body of working men should have it in their power thus to tyrannise over their fellow-

¹ Take also the following statement made by Tom Mann, as reported in the *Northern Echo* of Nov. 8, 1896, and allowed to pass without note or comment from the Press or from the public:—"Nothing short of the power to damage the interests of employers, and the courage to enforce that power, can obtain concessions for workers, and the same is true of politics."

working men, by entirely depriving them of that fundamental right of every Englishman—the right to choose his own master and his own rate of payment and hours of labour.” In former times the tyranny was all on the part of the masters, and they carried out their measures of oppression by Act of Parliament. But the events of the last seventy years have proved that working men can be quite as tyrannical towards those of their own class as any employers ever were. Monopoly has been the bane of industry and of commerce in the past, and a great part of the work of modern reformers has consisted in efforts to destroy one monopoly after another. There are still monopolies which are the great causes of the present bad times and trade depression—specially the monopoly of land and that of banking. But instead of intelligently joining with those enlightened reformers who are straining every nerve to remove the present deepening depression by removing those gigantic twin monopolies, the trades unions are exerting all their powers and exhausting their resources in endeavouring to establish a monopoly of labour. And in the attempt they themselves have become a form of organised tyranny most galling to the more intelligent of their own class, and detrimental to every form of industry and commerce in the country.

The remedy lies in a nutshell. Let the masters keep their works open, and give notice that no unionist will be employed. Let them invite non-unionists to come and work for them, and see that they are efficiently protected. This may be done by the prompt, vigorous, and faithful application of the law as it now stands, if only the magistrates will do their duty, aided by a competent police force, and, if needful, the military. In acting thus, they would have the support of all reasonable and law-abiding citizens, and would bring to an end a most dangerous manifestation of English democracy.

The leaders of the unions which authorise the strike and “call out the men,” should, at the same time, be made responsible for all the pecuniary loss and all the damage to the property of the firm against which the strike is directed. It is only an unaccountable indifference to the real character of this action of trades unions that has rendered it possible for capitalists and the administrators of the law to overlook this liability. But once let it be properly taken into account, and an action for damages commensurate with the injury done brought against the executive of every union by the company so injured, and it will revolutionise in the most wholesome manner these conflicts between capital and labour, and will force upon trades unionists the necessity of seeking the redress of their supposed grievances by methods more in harmony with justice and with the solidarity which by necessity exists between capital and labour.

SAMUEL FOTHERGILL.

AUGUSTUS WELBY PUGIN.

ONE of the most remarkable features in the architectural history of the nineteenth century is that enthusiastic revival of the Gothic style which, beginning in the second quarter of the century, persisted with unabated vigour for more than thirty years. Among the many able architects who during this period contributed to cover these islands with churches and other buildings designed in a style which for three centuries had been rejected as barbarous, but which is now recognised as one of the noblest styles ever produced by the wit of man, the name of Augustus Welby Pugin deserves to be the most conspicuous.

Pugin's father was an *émigré*, who, possessing a faculty for drawing, fell in his friendless state into the employment of Nash, the architect, and by degrees became himself a theoretical architect of some eminence, noted particularly for his enthusiasm for Gothic. The younger Pugin, born on April 1, 1812, imbibed the principles of Gothic architecture, as it were, with his mother's milk, and whenever he could hold a pencil began to exercise himself upon "examples" and "details." Before he was quite fifteen, however, the youth found a channel for his independent exertions, striking away from his father's historical and pictorial undertakings in order to design plate for Rundell & Bridge, the well-known silversmiths, and furniture for Windsor Castle. He also took up scene painting, and was commissioned to prepare the entire scenery for the new opera of *Kenilworth*. Then he went to sea. First, he acquired a small pleasure-boat, next a smack, and finally a schooner, with which he cruised about the Channel, carrying cargoes of eggs and collecting archæological curios. By-and-by, however, the schooner was wrecked off Leith, and Pugin, on the advice of an Edinburgh architect, who assisted him in his pitiful case, returned to civilisation and art. But his passion for the sea was never extinguished. His ordinary costume was that of a pilot, and but for his aversion to beer and tobacco he might have been taken for one. He is reported to have once said: "There is nothing worth living for but Chrisiane architecture and a boat." On his return home, Pugin commenced at business enterprise, and at the age of nineteen married. The business,

in which he had engaged was a forecast of the gigantic enterprises which were yet to flourish under his control—a manufactory of carved work and Gothic detail of every kind—but the experiment came to a disastrous end about the same time that he became a widower and a father. He now for the first time seriously addressed himself to the profession for which he had been educated, and seems to have secured a good architectural practice from the first.

Pugin's Protestantism had early been unsettled—very naturally, as his biographer seems to think, by “the miserably ugly building in Cross Street, Hatton Garden,” where his mother worshipped—but it was the then state of Ely Cathedral which brought matters to a climax.

“Would you believe it,” he writes, “there is no person appointed to attend to the repairs of the building, and the only person who has been employed during the last sixty years is a bricklayer? Not even common precautions are taken to keep the building dry. . . . I truly regret to say that in my travels I am daily witnessing fresh instances of the disgraceful conduct of the greater portion of the Established clergy. . . . I can assure you that, after a most close and impartial investigation, I feel perfectly convinced that the Roman Catholic Church is the only true one, and the only one in which the grand and sublime style of church architecture can be restored.”

The resolve which follows on this conclusion is perhaps reasonable enough. “A very good chapel,” he says, “is now building in the North, and when it is complete I certainly think I shall recant.” Whether he kept his time and recanted only when the chapel in the North was finished, it is impossible to say, but at all events he was soon received into the Church of Rome. Soon after his conversion Pugin published a book by which the new *régime* of art for which he longed received its first important stimulus. This work, published in 1836, was entitled *Contrasts*, and its purpose was to show the entire impossibility of Christian architecture in a Protestant community, and to demonstrate, not only that the Reformation had made an end of all true art appreciation of art in England, but that nothing save continued decay was possible until the nation had returned to the Church of Rome. The strength, and weakness, of this book lay, however, in its wealth of pictorial illustration; strength, because the decay of architecture since the Reformation was shown more clearly than was at all possible in the printed text; weakness, because such an exposure of architectural monstrosities alongside of some of the finest specimens of the art roused the Established clergy to a sense of the facts of the case and brought about a reform which overthrew the thesis of the printed pages. Before long, Pugin had every sort of work on hand for the service of his new church—stained-glass, brasswork, goldsmiths' work, and ecclesiastical millinery were executed under his superintendence. As early as 1836 a

Catholic divine complimented him with the assurance he felt that Pugin's designs of Catholic church plate "would on many occasions propitiate the goodwill of the man of taste towards the olden faith, and perhaps induce some to inquire into and adopt its tenets." In one way Pugin's conversion to Roman Catholicism was fortunate, since it saved him from the temptation of assisting in that movement of falsification and vulgarisation which, under the name of "restoration," was beginning to devastate mediæval buildings. In another way it was unfortunate, for his Catholic employers were almost always pinched for money, and at the same time so devoid of sympathy for the principles of which he was the chief exponent, that they almost always insisted on the greatest amount of display at the cheapest rate. In very many cases his designs were seriously injured both by the cutting down of their carefully considered proportions, and by the introduction of shams (a thing always hateful to Pugin), such as plaster groining, and even cast-iron imitation carving! At the outset, however, all went well with Pugin; he gained the friendship of Lord Shrewsbury, as ardent a Catholic and anxious an opponent of "depraved sacerdotal vestments" as himself; and business simply poured in on him. The publication, in 1841, of *The True Principles of Gothic Architecture* established his fame; although by that time there had risen against him a party in the Church for which he had laboured so hard—men who believed that St. Peter's, Rome, is the model for a Christian church, and who did not hesitate to say so. We need not linger over Pugin's journeys and criticisms during this busy period. He went to Rome, where he was utterly horrified. "St. Peter's," he furiously writes, "is far more ugly than I expected, and more vilely constructed, a mass of imposition; bad taste of every kind seems to have run riot in this place." The story goes that he fell on his knees to give thanks because he thought he had discovered an ominous crack in an important part of the huge building.

In 1851 came the great Papal effort, the re-establishment of the hierarchy in England. Pugin 'plunged into the affair with an *Earnest Address*, urging on Catholics, as the practical end of his discourse, the necessity of supporting their new episcopate by voluntary tithes of their substance; but, at the same time, reading the hierarchy an historical lecture on the shortcomings of other hierarchies in past times, pointing out that the sins and schisms of the Anglican Church were due not so much to Protestantism as to the treachery and depravity of the last Catholic bishops who flourished in England. The new dignitaries could not suffer the earnestness of the *Address* to atone for such plain speaking, and proceedings were taken to have the work placed upon the *Index*. It is impossible to say what connection, if any, exists between this rebuff and what immediately followed. The fact remains that within a year the news

leaked out that Pugin was in Bedlam, whence he was removed only to die, on September 14, 1852.

Than Augustus Welby Pugin, no man more thoroughly mastered the true principles of the Gothic style in its various stages, both in its leading lines and in the minutest details of its mouldings and carved enrichments, and that too at a time when illustrated works of Gothic architecture could scarcely be got. All through his life, and in many visits to the Continent, he continued to make, for his own instruction and amusement, great numbers of drawings and sketches which are placed by authorities among the most beautiful architectural sketches ever produced. How much of the work of the Houses of Parliament was Pugin's and how much Sir Charles Barry's is still a moot point; but it is generally conceded that to Pugin is due the remarkable excellence of all the "details" in this great building, executed, it should not be forgotten, at a time when nearly every example of revived Gothic was of the most trashy description. He (Pugin) not only designed and even modelled a great part of the sculpture and other decorations, but had actually to train a school of masons and carvers to carry out the designs with accuracy. Pugin was very broad in his love of the mediæval styles, but on the whole preferred what is really the most suited to modern requirements—namely, the Perpendicular of the fifteenth century. The cathedral of Killarney and the chapel of the Benedictine monastery at Douai were perhaps the church buildings which were carried out with the least deviation from his original conception; but he himself was wont to say that the only church he ever executed with unalloyed satisfaction was the one at Ramsgate, which he not only designed but paid for. He built St. Augustine's on his cliff in flinty solidity and strength; he decorated its little chancel with all the love of an enthusiastic artist; he blazoned its windows with that revived art which he himself had done so much to bring to perfection, and lingered with tender touches over the enrichment of all its accessories. From first to last the church and land cost upwards of fifteen thousand pounds, and this sum he spared from his yearly income as the labour of love progressed. In St. Augustine's, Augustus Pugin has his grave within the sound of the waves he loved so well.

Sometime before he was struck down Pugin had commenced a book, which he describes as being "on the real cause of the change of religion in the sixteenth century, which will place matters in an entirely new light, overthrow the present opinions on both sides, and may be the means of tending to much mutual charity on both sides, and a better understanding." The work was intended to set forth more fully the theory of the *Earnest Address*, that Catholicism in England had been overthrown by Catholics, and that the state of the Romish Church at the time was sufficient to account for this. Pugin acknowledges that it was the English Church which had pre-

served the monuments of Catholic antiquity, and in some measure atones for his many virulent attacks on her with these words, the last he ever wrote :

“Let us then always speak and think with gratitude of the old bridge that has brought us over, and lend a pious help to restore her time-worn piers, wasted by the torrents of dissent and infidelity, but which God, in His mercy, beyond our human understanding, appears yet to sustain and to make it the marvel of some of the most zealous men that have appeared since the ancient glory of the Church in the pious early times. *Pax omnibus. Amen.*”

ROBT. M. LOCKHART.

A PROTEST AGAINST LOW WORKS OF FICTION.

MANY years of compulsory education have at length empowered every English man and woman to read ; with few exceptions, the man or woman unable to do so is now practically extinct. Arrived at this satisfactory result, valuable as it is in the superlative degree, placing within the reach of all a power of immense proportions which was formerly a privilege of a limited number, it is matter for great regret that many people put their power to read to base use. This is proved by the immense demand, unhappily increasing at a great pace, for books and periodicals which display imaginary vice and immorality, which the majority of readers to-day appear to revel in. Whether the tastes of readers or the aims of writers were above those of the present time in Cowper's days it is difficult to conjecture ; the following lines of his are, however, very true to-day :

“ Ye writers of what none with safety reads,
Footing it in the dance that fancy leads ;
Ye novelists, who mar what ye would mend,
Snivelling and drivelling folly without end,
Whose corresponding misses fill the ream
With sentimental frippery and dream,
Caught in a delicate soft silken net
By some lewd earl or rakehell baronet ;
Ye primps, who, under virtue's fair pretence,
Steal to the closet of young innocence ; . . .

Howe'er disguised the inflammatory tale,
And covered with a fine-spun specious veil,
Such writers, and such readers, owe the gust
And relish of their pleasure all to lust.”

Thus being able to read is, to those who read mischievous and pernicious books, a channel which conveys to the mind pollution, and those who read such literature imbibe evil thoughts and ideas which propagate in the mind irreparable damage. Such, however, is the taste of the majority of people who read, whose object in reading is to amuse, occupy the mind, or to fathom the obscene—all bad motives, all detrimental to morals, all opposed to the culture of the intellect. What a sad and disastrous result is this of placing in the hands of

people freedom to acquire knowledge ! It shows that many are untrustworthy, unreliable, callous, and indifferent to their own good and welfare, and not capable of taking care of themselves when damaging influence accosts them. Such people fall easy victims to the miserable allurements and the wretched charms attached to a parade of evil. It is impossible to put any muzzle upon such readers by taking from them the power of reading, though, if it were possible, it would be conferring upon them a benefit to do so, for an examination of the innermost parts of crime and wickedness can scarcely fail to adversely influence the senses. The late Sir James F. Stephen's strong censure, some years ago at Worcester Assizes, teaches those whose tastes are in the direction of looking into the obscene a lesson. This learned judge, observing a concourse of people in the gallery of the court, listening with apparent pleasure to the evidence in a case of a revolting nature, expressed his strong disgust at their taste, and the pain which it gave him to be compelled to listen to such shocking disclosures.

Books have been called companions : no better description could be employed ; and as bad company with foul minds, bad books with foul contents damage irreparably the thoughts of their readers, impregnate them with vile ideas, and put trash in the place which should be occupied by valuable knowledge. It is well known that an inebriate perpetually indulging in an excess of strong alcohol destroys his taste, and can appreciate no other than strong drink, for which he always craves ; this is similar to the reader of vile books : his taste is destroyed, and he can appreciate no others after he has accustomed his taste to, and saturated his mind with, abominable publications. Further, pernicious literature appears to consume the very intellect of its readers, as opium-smoking destroys the intellect of the smoker ; for such readers appear to possess no knowledge of matters which directly or indirectly affect themselves or their fellow-creatures ; they take but little, if any, interest in matters which rightly claim the attention of all members of the human race, but concentrate their attention upon what is called by the far too mild name, sensational literature. When this is remembered it need occasion no surprise that so many people are to be found in all grades of society who are upon political and social matters most ignorant. Men having the power to vote for Members of Parliament, and women in influential positions, are to be found in large numbers professing to be members of a party or a school, who know not even the principles of such, and appear not anxious in the least to acquire the knowledge, though they are longing with almost mental anguish to know what the end may be of a hero or a villain in some story which they have commenced to read in a third-rate publication. The newspaper is one of the greatest, if not the greatest, secondary educational power at the disposal of the public ; now it is duty free,

it is possible for sixpence a week to read in it news of interest, matters political and social which concern all classes of men and women, and high-class articles written by men of great intellectual power; a knowledge of these subjects can alone raise a man or woman from great depths of ignorance, but how large a number of men and women of all classes resolutely refuse to grasp this helping hand which is held out to them, in favour of most degrading works of fiction! Readers of this class also, as a rule, entirely discard sound literature; they scarcely know that such writers as Shakespeare or Milton ever lived, or if they ever heard of their names, they know not who they were, what they were, or what they wrote. If the works of high-class writers are upon the shelves of those who make a practice of reading rubbish, those works remain unlooked at, while the low novel is sought with keen anxiety, and time is occupied in its perusal always at the expense of the intellect, and often to the neglect of duties of vast importance. People pay visits to libraries, procure books, and spend hours daily in reading, and often speak of it with apparent pride, but, as a rule, they only read what may be called pastimes. Such readers are consequently never in any way improved by their reading, though well up in the details of imagined murders and acts of immorality, which authors have put before them to amuse and gratify their shallow minds. Demoralising literature does not find its patrons in any one class of society; on the contrary, such is read by the lady in the drawing-room as well as by the domestic servant in the kitchen; by the man of good position down to the office-boy, who has often been induced to become a thief or a forger in consequence of examples set before him in works of fiction. The only means of grappling in any way with the evil would appear to be by urging parents and guardians of boys and girls, and schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, to lose no opportunity of making an onslaught on all literature calculated to corrupt the morals, for the taste for such is generally acquired when the reader is young. It is stated that the Princess of Wales at one time made a practice of reading all books which her family wished to read, to ascertain if such were suitable; this is an example which parents would do well to follow. The power of the pulpit should also be directed against the reading of all literature which is in any way unwholesome, impure, or irreligious. Ministers of religion have a great opportunity of doing a good work in this direction, for members of their congregations are often to be found who are devoted readers of books of a demoralising species. Free libraries should entirely discard books of bad influence, and educate and elevate the tastes of the reading public by putting before it only those works which are calculated to effect these objects.

This truly is a novel-reading age; the English, at the present time, at all events, are a novel-reading people; they delight in

having their minds occupied with the imaginations of others, put before them in attractive and interesting shape and colour. Novel-reading in its true sense, as pursued by the average reader of the average book, is, however, a direct detriment to society, and it would be good for all if the great rage for works of fiction were to spend itself and decay ; unfortunately there are no signs of any such revolution in the tastes of the people ; it is, however, much to be hoped that the standard of books may be raised from its present very low level, and that the passion of readers for books of infamy may be at least mitigated, if not brought absolutely into subjection.

T. M. HOPKINS.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

THERE is a tendency among many geologists to assume that their branch of science is of very recent origin, and few will be found who are personally acquainted with the writings of Hutton and Werner. Sir Archibald Geikie has therefore done good service in collecting and arranging in a most interesting and readable form¹ the most salient episodes in the lives of the more prominent geologists who laid the foundations of the science about the middle of last century. We know of no work in which the claims of workers of various nationalities are so fairly considered and explained as has been done by the author in what is comparatively a very small space. Such names as Guettard, de Saussure, Lehmann, von Buch and Werner are placed side by side with our own countrymen Hutton, Playfair, Hall, and William Smith, and in no case will national prejudice be found to stand in the way of a fair consideration of the claims of each. We think, however, that Sir Archibald Geikie lays rather too much stress on Werner's dogmatism. It was the fashion of his day to be dogmatic, and, even if many of his supposed facts have since been found to be fiction, what geological writer of this nineteenth century can assume that none of his own facts will be discredited before another generation shall have passed away? Werner had a happy knack of awakening interest in the science which he taught for forty years at Freiberg, and we must not forget that it was the researches of students whom he had himself trained that brought many of the facts to light which subsequently upset the Wernerian theory. Free as it is from unnecessary technicalities, Sir A. Geikie's work should find a wide circle of readers among scientific men.

Another short treatise which will do much to popularise a branch of science that has made gigantic strides during the last few years, is Mr. S. P. Thompson's *Light, Visible and Invisible*.² Based upon a series of lectures delivered at the Royal Institution, this

¹ *The Founders of Geology*. By Sir Archibald Geikie. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1897.

² *Light, Visible and Invisible*. By S. P. Thompson. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1897.

work has now been issued with appendices which deal in detail with a number of subjects that were only briefly referred to in the lectures themselves. Professor Thompson is so well known for the ingenuity of the apparatus which he has devised and adapted for lecture purposes that the reader of this work will not be surprised to find numerous practical devices illustrated which render the study of the molecular action of light not only easy but also interesting. As might be expected, the Röntgen rays occupy a prominent position in these lectures, and the remarks upon them are accompanied by an excellent portrait of Professor Röntgen. It is a good illustration of the importance attached to science by our German competitors that the little town of Würzburg, of 61,000 inhabitants, where Professor Röntgen teaches physics, has a university with an income of £41,000 a year. Bavaria, with 6,000,000 inhabitants, supports three universities at a cost of £150,000 annually. A rich city like London, with 5,000,000 inhabitants, does not maintain even one university, for what is known as the University of London is merely an examining body with no funds available for research. It is of little use spending large sums on institutions for technical education when there are no universities to train teachers. Professor Thompson's book will do much to popularise the science of which it treats, and we are glad that in this form his lectures have become accessible to a wider audience.

*Mathematical Psychology*¹ is the misleading title of a little book which contains no mathematics, and the merest traces of psychology. There is a good deal about vivisection and mortisection in the volume, and a number of other miscellaneous subjects are referred to in a disconnected manner. Perhaps Mr. Gratry's plan of study may explain this. He "formed the habit of sitting alone, once a day and so far as possible at the same hour, pen in hand; he suspended thought, making silence within the soul, and then wrote down whatever thoughts came to him about the unity of nature." Those thoughts, creeping into the silent soul in spite of their suspension, have evidently interfered with the unity of the work before us. We are also told that: "the physician of a large asylum kindly allowed me to spend a week or two occasionally among his patients." We must commend the hospitality of that physician.

Those interested in moral science will be glad to learn that the first volume of Professor Wundt's *Ethik* has been translated into English and will shortly be followed by the two other volumes.² The translation of a work of so highly technical a character is not an easy task; but the translators have carried it out satisfactorily on the whole. In some cases, perhaps, a less literal adhesion to the

¹ *The Mathematical Psychology of Gratry and Boole.* By M. E. Boole. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. 1897.

² *The Facts of the Moral Life.* By W. Wundt. Translated by Professors Julia Gulliver and E. B. Fitchener. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1897.

German original word might have been productive of better English ; but we cannot say that we have met with any instances where the meaning of the author has not been reproduced. The pagination of the original German book might well have been omitted ; no reader who does not know enough German to find the page will be likely to refer to the original.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

*Ethical Systems*¹ forms the second volume of Professor Wilhelm Wundt's work on *Ethics: an Investigation of the Facts and Laws of the Moral Life*; the translation of this volume being the work of Professor Margaret Floy Washburn, or rather the volume in its English form is a translation of the second book of Professor Wundt's *Ethik*. The translation is very clear and readable. This part of Wundt's work forms a brief history of ethics, and is somewhat on the same lines, but much more concise than Dr. Martineau's *Types of Ethical Theory*.

Short as the work is, considering the extent of the subject, it is thorough and instructive. The author begins with a brief sketch of the earliest known ethical opinions, pre-Socratic, passes in review the ethics of Plato and Aristotle, and through the stoic and epicurean to the Christian, Augustinian, Scholastic, and Reformation, which brings us within sight of modern ethics, Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Hume, &c., in England and Scotland, and the theories of such philosophers as Descartes, Spinoza, and Leibniz ; Kant, Fichte, and Hegel on the Continent. After the historical sketch, the work concludes with a brief and able criticism of the various ethical systems. Some interesting paragraphs close the volume on the most recent development—evolutionary ethics, in which Professor Wundt discusses the relative merits of individual evolutionism and universal evolutionism. The conclusion appears to be that the aim of individual perfection, which has been the goal of modern ethics, will have to be supplemented or superseded by a wider or universal aim. The *social will* as a moral force must be taken into account ; but this does not mean the abolition of individualism. " If the extreme historical form of the theory pushes this principle so far as to lose sight of individual morality almost altogether, and to resign the normative function for the most part to positive law, the reason is to

¹ *Ethical Systems*. By William Wundt. Translated by Margaret Floy Washburn. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co. New York : The Macmillan Co. 1897.

be found chiefly in the fact that it regards the individual will as a mere instrument of the social will, whereas history teaches us that it is really the individual wills which determine the tendency of the social will."

The fifth volume of the "Tudor Library," which we have received from Mr. David Nutt, is a very beautiful reprint of George Colville's translation of Boethius' celebrated *Consolation of Philosophy*.¹ The work has been most carefully and ably edited by Mr. Ernest Belfort Bax, who also supplies a brief biographical and critical introduction. We are also presented with Colville's dedication of his translation to Queen Mary, and his prologue. Colville's original spelling is preserved throughout. The charm of the *Consolation* is almost indescribable. The calm, the seriousness, and the elegance of the work are well known, and it is a happy relief to turn from the shallowness and restlessness of much modern literature to these philosophic pages. The volume, of which only 250 copies are published, is beautifully printed and tastefully bound in vellum, and gold lettered.

We have received from Messrs. Macmillan & Co. the second volume of the *Holy Bible* in the "Eversley" series. This volume contains the Books of Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, and I. and II. Samuel. We consider this by far the best edition, for reading purposes, of the Bible in the authorised version that we have ever met with. It is possible with this edition in one's hand to read the Bible "like any other book." It will help to "depolarise" the Bible as Dr. Oliver Wendell Holmes wished. The ordinary editions in small type, cut up into chapters and verses, always give the impression of something unusual, if not sacred, about the Bible—an impression which, no doubt, in a measure, we have derived from its use in church and school, while the practice of wresting passages from their context and calling them "texts," is utterly destructive of all intelligent understanding of the contents of the books, which it often appears to us are entirely unknown to many persons who are great at quoting "texts." If this edition of the Bible leads, as it ought to do, to its being more widely and intelligently read, the editor, Mr. J. W. Mackail, will deserve great praise. For the more the Bible is read the less will it be superstitiously venerated. We regret that in our notice of the first volume a slip was allowed to pass, and "paraphrasing" was printed instead of "paraphrased."

The numerous admirers and friends of the late Dr. C. J. Vaughan, Dean of Llandaff, and formerly Master of the Temple, will welcome

¹ *Boethius' Consolation of Philosophy*. Translated from the Latin by George Colville, 1556. Edited with an Introduction by Ernest Belfort Bax. London: David Nutt. 1897.

this collection of *University and Other Sermons*¹ by the distinguished preacher. Dr. Vaughan had a special power of his own as a preacher, and though we should not consider him an attractive one, his deep seriousness, moral earnestness, and entire absence of all artificiality made him unusually influential. There is no trace of anything that can be called advanced in this volume: as a preacher he appears to have been quite undisturbed by critical questions, but the sermons are in other respects far above the average.

Archdeacon Cheetham's Hulsean Lectures on *The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian*² may be taken as a kind of counterblast to the late Dr. Edwin Hatch's Hibbert Lectures on *The Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages on the Christian Church*. Dr. Cheetham, while not denying that there is some trace of the influence of the mysteries in the form of the Christian sacraments, would limit this influence to a more natural and pardonable adoption of certain forms and terms, but denies that they were in any measure causative. He minimises the undoubted resemblances which exist, and upon which Dr. Hatch and others lay so much stress; but this is necessary to his contention that the Christian Church is an original and divine institution. To admit that it owes much to Pagan ideas and practices would be destructive of its supernatural claims. The lectures are not very profound nor convincing.

Mr. Wiseman calls his book *The Dynamics of Religion*,³ an essay in English culture history; but we are unable to understand why. It is an account of the struggle between clericalism and freethought, in which the writer maintains that all men, especially priests, are given to lying when self-interest demands it. Mr. Wiseman's general principle is that the Church does not fight for truth and righteousness, as it professes to do, but for money, power, and reputation. The author seeks to establish the general truth of this proposition by a review of the forces which led to the Reformation in England, the conquest of the Orthodox party over the Deists of the last century, and the success of the High Church movement in our own time. Mr. Wiseman is a vigorous and uncompromising critic of all priests and theologians, and though sometimes we are inclined to think he is too sweeping in his denunciations, he is willing to make allowances for the irresistible influence of "social pressure." *The Dynamics of Religion* combines criticism with history, though we think undue space is allotted to the account of the Deistic controversy, which is, nevertheless, interesting reading.

¹ *University and Other Sermons*. By C. J. Vaughan, D.D. Late Dean of Llandaff, &c. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1897.

² *The Mysteries, Pagan and Christian*. Being the Hulsean Lectures for 1896-97. By S. Cheetham, D.D., F.S.A. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1897.

³ *The Dynamics of Religion*. By M. W. Wiseman. London: The University Press, Ltd. 1897.

Mr. Wiseman still sees in the numerical strength and wealth of the clergy a menace to intellectual liberty ; but he consoles himself with the conviction that the real progress of freethought is greater than it appears to be.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

By his *Better Administration of the Poor-law*, Mr. W. Chance has already established a claim to be regarded as a competent authority upon questions connected with the working of the Poor-laws and his new work, entitled *Children under the Poor-law*,¹ will still further enhance his reputation. In the former work he purposely refrained from dealing at length with the education and maintenance of pauper children, as a Departmental Committee was then holding an inquiry upon this subject. But although the Committee has issued its Report, the discussion to which it has given rise appears to Mr. Chance to show how little the general public knows about the subject ; and one might add how little that portion of which may be designated "Villadom," really cares, for there is no question whatever that large numbers of persons in easy circumstances still refuse to believe in education as a preventive of pauperism and crime.

In the introduction Mr. Chance traces the history of the subject from the year 1834 to the present time, showing the progress of Poor-law education. Up to 1861 was the period of workhouse schools, which in that year were denounced in a wholesale manner by the Royal Commission on Education, but which Mr. Chance shows were far from deserving this censure. When they failed it was from want of efficient administration rather than from a defective system. Then followed the more general establishment of district and separate schools, and the commencement of the boarding-out system *without* the unions. In 1874 appeared Mrs. Nassau Senior's report on the Poor-law schools, which gave rise to the controversy still raging as as to respective merits of large schools and boarding-out.

Mr. Chance then proceeds to describe the various systems of education and training at present in force, commencing with workhouse schools, district and separate schools, cottage home schools, and detached homes.

Chapter VI. describes the use made of public elementary schools, in country districts where the children in workhouses are usually

¹ *Children under the Poor-law. Their Education, Training, and After-care. Together with a Criticism of the Report of the Departmental Committee on Metropolitan Poor-law Schools.* By W. Chance, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Hon. Sec. Central Poor-law Conference. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. 1897.

free. The next two chapters deal with the boarding-out system, pointing out the dangers which surround this popular system, and Chapter IX. describes the use made of certified and uncertified institutions, and of training-ships.

The various kinds of employment open to pauper children and the means of disposing of them after they leave the hands of guardians are next discussed, separate chapters dealing with the important question of how that disturbing element in a Poor-law school—the “ins and outs”—can be best dealt with. The concluding chapter criticises various reforms suggested in recent years, in which Mr. Chance declares his object to have been, not to advocate any one system, but rather to point out how defects, from which no system can be entirely free, may be remedied. Every system now in use, he says, is capable of producing good results. One system may suit one locality better than another. It is a question rather of administration than of systems. This is altogether a painstaking and admirable book.

In *L'Individue et la Société*¹ M. Jean Grave strives to show that “authority,” as embodied in the State, is the true hindrance to civilisation. It appears to us that M. Grave is entirely wrong in his history, and consequently in his conclusions. Instead of government as a whole (taking the good with the bad) having been a hindrance to individual liberty, it has been the great means of extending it. In primitive societies individual liberty was of the slightest. Under an enlightened modern government man never was so free. And apart from this, until we arrive at an Utopian state of things, where every man does exactly what he ought to do simply from motives of duty, it is absurd to talk about abolishing authority and organised social power.

VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

The Reminiscences of a Bashi-Bazouk,² by Mr. Edward Vizetelly, is an extremely interesting book. In the autumn of 1876 Mr. Vizetelly, who had seen some fighting in France and Algeria, tired of inaction and filled with hatred for Russia, decided to enlist in the Sultan's service in view of the approaching war. This was easier said than

¹ *L'Individue et la Société*. Par Jean Grave. Paris: P. V. Stock. 1897.

² *The Reminiscences of a Bashi-Bazouk*. By Edward Vizetelly (Bertin Clere), formerly Special Correspondent of the *Daily News*, the *Standard*, and the *New York Herald*, &c. With Fifty-five Drawings by Georges Montbard, and some Photographs. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith. London: Simpkin Marshall, Hamilton, Kent and Co., Ltd.

done. At Constantinople Mr. Vizetelly joined "the Polish Legion," but, beyond inscribing his name in a book at headquarters, he got no further, and so, abandoning all hope of active service in Europe, he set out to the seat of war in Asia. But here, too, he was equally unsuccessful in joining the Turkish army proper, and was eventually obliged to fall back on the Circassian levies; and thus Mr. Vizetelly became a Bashi-Bazouk, or member of the irregular Turkish troops, and so set out with his regiment to the seat of war. After passing through Erzeroum, Mr. Vizetelly reached Anatolia, where Mouktar Pacha was established on the crest of the Soghanli Dag, closely pressed by the Russian army, which was investing Kars. Before Mr. Vizetelly, however, was able to take part in any real fighting he was left the almost sole representative of the Bashi-Bazouks. The conduct of these gentry in the field is well known, and it is difficult to conceive any Englishman joining their ranks. Three men having been court-martialled and executed for a gross outrage, the whole force decamped. Mr. Vizetelly then witnessed the fall of Kars, and when the investment of Erzeroum threatened to become complete, escaped from that city and, returning to Constantinople, saw the conclusion of the war. In the meantime, however, he had become the special correspondent of the *Standard* of the war in the East. Finding his occupation gone at Constantinople, he set out for Greece, where an irregular warfare had broken out on the frontier. This movement, however, was too late, and it came to nothing.

There is plenty of action in this story of a war correspondent, as might be expected, as well as good descriptions of places and people, although we cannot always agree with the author's political conclusions.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

The volume entitled *Men who have Made the Empire*¹ is rather jingoistic in tone. What does the author mean by the statement in his "Foreword" that "the British Empire, as it stands to-day, is the greatest moral and material fact in human history"? This is ridiculously untrue. Mr. George Griffith is apparently a worshipper of force. But it is ideas, after all, not "big battalions" that govern the world. The sketch of Cromwell is well done, but the book sins by the distorted view it presents of history.

¹ *Men who have Made the Empire*. By George Griffith. London: C. Arthur Pearson, Ltd.

Charles the Great,¹ by Mr. Thomas Hodgkin, is an admirable specimen of biography. Scarcely an incident in the life of the great Emperor is left untouched. The author shows great impartiality and, at the same time, is not sparing of censure when it is warranted by circumstances.

BELLES LETTRES.

The utter want of probability which is obvious in *Pepita of the Pagoda*² is counterbalanced by a freshness and simplicity of style rarely found in works of fiction. The story itself is a tragic farce. A half crazy clerical baronet, his son, an eccentric dreamer, and the heroine, a ballet-dancer, are the principal figures in this fantastic romance. We believe it will be found pre-eminently readable, but we wish it were more real.

*King Olaf's Kinsman*³ is a capital boy's story. The interest is well sustained, and the purely historical portion of the tale is both accurate and interesting.

*Paris at Bay*⁴ is supposed to be the personal narrative of Geoffrey Townsend, nephew to a French colonel, and a volunteer in the French service at the time of the siege of Paris. The story contains a lively description of the Battle of Sedan. Some injustice is done to the Communards, who were not all ignoble. The illustrations in the book are excellent.

In *Lords of the World*,⁵ that admirable writer of historical tales of classical times, the Rev. A. J. Church, groups a number of picturesque incidents round the person of a young Greek, who vainly strives to resist the conquering Romans. The picture given of the Romans is not flattering. Their brutal cruelty is perhaps too strongly emphasised. The Romans were, after all, a great civilising power, and in every way they compare favourably with the Carthaginians. The scene describing the defiance of Hasdrubal's wife, Salamo, to the Romans, and the fall of Carthage is very dramatic. This tale ought to prove interesting, not merely to young, but to grown-up readers.

*With Moore at Corunna*⁶ is one of Mr. Henty's best stories. The

¹ *Charles the Great*. By Thomas Hodgkin, D.C.L. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd.

² *Pepita of the Pagoda*. (Arrowsmith's Annual, Christmas 1897). By Tighe Hopkins. Bristol: Arrowsmith.

³ *King Olaf's Kinsman*. By Charles W. Whistler. London: Blackie & Son.

⁴ *Paris at Bay*. A Story of the Siege and Commune. By Herbert Hayens. London: Blackie & Son.

⁵ *Lords of the World*. A Tale of the Fall of Carthage and Corinth. By Alfred J. Church. London: Blackie & Son.

⁶ *With Moore at Corunna*. By G. A. Henty. London: Blackie & Son.

Irish element in it recalls Lever's *Charles O'Malley*. Though Mr. Henty lacks Lever's sparkling humour, he is more accurate on purely historical points than the famous Irish novelist. This book will be read with breathless interest from cover to cover.

A dictionary of Australasian words under the title of *Austral-English*,¹ has been published by Messrs. Macmillan & Co. From the introduction by Professor Edward E. Morris, we learn that the genesis of this work was the collection of words peculiar to Australasia for Dr. Murray's *Oxford English Dictionary*. Many of the words in this Australasian dictionary are names of birds, trees, and flowers, as might be expected. A long explanation is given of the word "Australia" itself, which, of course signifies "southern land"—*terra Australis*. A very curious Australianism is "bung," to go bankrupt, which appears to be an aboriginal term. No satisfactory explanation is given of the well-known word "boomerang," applied to a peculiar weapon used by the Australian aborigines. There is another weapon called the "woomera," and both words may possibly have a common origin.

*A Matrimonial Freak*² is one of those silly books which should never have been published. Regarded either as a story or a psychological study it is a ghastly failure. We advise the lady who wrote it to give up attempting to produce novels, and to devote herself instead to domestic life, which is perhaps her true vocation.

*The American Cousins*³ is a book that will repay perusal. It is by no means, however, Sarah Tytler's best effort.

There is a certain gloomy power about the novel which bears the title of *For the Life of Others*.⁴ The author is no tyro, but has not yet learned the art of writing a story with simplicity and directness. We would suggest to writers who suffer from this fault to study more closely the works of Mr. Hardy.

The Black Disc,⁵ by Albert Lee, reminds us of *Damas the Elder*. Indeed, it is written evidently by an admirer of the author of *The Forty-five Guardsmen*, and many other romances. The story is well told, though the style lacks distinction.

*Sir Gaspar's Affinity*⁶ is one of those books which might be written by a clever schoolgirl. The story is readable, but it is the very opposite of lifelike.

The last portion of the *Oxford Dictionary*⁷ issued is a double

¹ *Austral-English*. A Dictionary of Australasian Words, Phrases, and Usages. By Edward E. Morris, M.A., Oxon. Professor of English, French and German in Melbourne University. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd.

² *A Matrimonial Freak*. By Edith M. Page. London: Digby, Long & Co.

³ *The American Cousins*. By Sarah Tytler. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁴ *For the Life of Others*. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

⁵ *The Black Disc*. A Story of the Conquest of Granada. By Albert Lee. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁶ *Sir Gaspar's Affinity*. By Mina Sandeman. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁷ *The Oxford Dictionary*. By H. Bradley. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

number. The explanations given of some well-known words, such as "forehead," are very elaborate. Mr. Henry Bradley has done his work well.

It would be hard to find a more wretched specimen of literary craftsmanship than Mr. Clement Shorter's volume entitled, with amusing grandiloquence, *Victorian Literature: Sixty Years of Books and Bookmen*.¹ There is really no intelligent account given in the volume of a notable book produced during Queen Victoria's reign, and the bookmen are merely enumerated, with a few slipshod biographical or quasi-critical remarks. There is an elaborate index, which virtually contains just as much real information as the 193 pages which precede it. There is more genuine appreciation of English writers, either in prose or verse, in one page of the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke's *Primer of English Literature* than in Mr. Shorter's entire book.

*The Sack of Monte Carlo*² is a lively, amusing narrative. It certainly has not much literary merit, and it can scarcely claim the distinction of being quite original. Nevertheless, it will find readers, who will go from the first to the last page without being bored—and that is saying a great deal in this age of excessive book-production.

*Dust o' Glamour*³ is a novel of much the same sort as *The Woman Who Did* and *I Forbid the Banns*. In some respects it is superior to either of these two books. It is less artificial, and the irregular union of Geoffrey Gray and Irene Tempest has at least a certain air of probability about it. Of course, as a piece of propagandism, in the form of fiction, Mr. Grant Allen's novel is more effective. But *Dust o' Glamour* is, in spite of the theme, a fascinating work, and proves that Mr. Warwick possesses remarkable talent.

ART.

PROFESSOR LANCIANI has long been favourably known as an entertaining as well as learned writer on ancient Rome. For a quarter of a century he has been familiar with the excavations which have brought to light details of the Eternal City such as Gibbon only dreamed of, with the result that Imperial Rome is better known than the Paris of Philip Augustus. His experience as professor of ancient topography in the University of Rome has also fitted him to be the interpreter of purely technical researches; and his habit of

¹ *Victorian Literature: Sixty Years of Books and Bookmen*. By Clement Shorter. London: Ames Bowden.

² *The Sack of Monte Carlo*. By Walter Frith. Bristol: Arrowsmith.

³ *Dust o' Glamour*. By H. Sydney Warwick. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

publishing his works in English, for an English-reading public, is another title to favour. It may be said freely that he has given the best work of its kind in his new volume on *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*.¹

"In writing the present volume the author does not intend to publish a complete manual of Roman topography, but only a companion book for students and travellers who visit the existing remains and study the latest excavations of ancient Rome. The text, therefore, has been adapted to the requirements of both classes of readers. Students wishing to attain a higher degree of efficiency in this branch of Roman archæology will find copious references to the standard publications on each subject or part of a subject; while the description of ruins and excavations will not be found too technical or one-sided for the ordinary reader. Special attention has been paid to tracing back to their places of origin the spoils of each monument, now dispersed in the museums of Rome, Italy, and the rest of Europe. The reader, being informed what these spoils are, when they were carried away, and where they are to be found at present, will be able to form a more correct idea of the former aspect of Roman monuments than would otherwise be possible. The volume contains also some tables, which will be found useful for quick and easy reference to the chronology of buildings, to events in the history of the city, and to the various aspects of Roman civilisation. It may be observed, in the last place, that the illustrations of the text are mostly original, from drawings and photographs prepared expressly for this work."

This simple exposition of the scope of his work the author has fulfilled in every particular. The single reproach that we have found plausible is the position of the table of contents as the last of the thirteen indices! The book consists of 631 small octavo pages, with 216 illustrations, comprising the necessary maps and plans. Text, designs, and even the reproduction of recent photographs, are clear and easy of understanding. Everywhere the habits of the sympathetic and successful teacher are apparent—the highest praise that can be given to a work like this.

The special character of the book is that it explains ancient Rome as it exists unearthed in the present city. To the general student this "actuality" is half the charm of archæology, and more than half the profit of ancient history. The work is divided into four books. The first gives general information, from the original configuration of the soil in prehistoric times, down through man's work in quarries and bridges and walls to "the burial of Rome." The second book follows the ruins and excavations of the Palatine; the third is a walk through the Sacra Via from the Coliseum to the

¹ *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*. By Rodolfo Lanciani, D.C.L. London: Macmillan & Co. 1897.

Capitoline Hill; and the fourth takes up, one by one, the fourteen *regiones* in the city, with the ruins of the Caelian Hill. To the general aspect of the city, at the end, are added twelve reference tables, indices alphabetical and chronological, with dates of emperors, kings, and popes, art-work, coins, weights and measures, the Roman Calendar and ancient marbles. Such interesting, but difficult, questions as that of the private habitations of the great city—where the classics say little and time has preserved less—are treated thoroughly and readably; and the bibliography merits all praise. It is a book which has the Latin qualities of which the French boast—clearness with literary form; but it has also the German *gründlich keit*, with none of the wearisomeness of Teutonic erudition—

“Fortis, et in se ipso totus teres atque rotundus!”

A retired chaplain of the East Indian Service, recollecting that he is a University man, and doubtless indulging a passion of many years' steady growth, has published a small but very full volume of seventy-five pages on *The Ancient Use of the Greek Accents in Reading and Chanting; with some newly restored Greek Melodies*.¹ It is the musical part of the work, with its eighteen tunes, from ancient inscriptions or mediæval manuscripts, or adapted from the Gregorian tones, which will chiefly interest. The discussion is too technical to be resumed here; but it is clear enough to those who have the preliminary knowledge of what has been found in ancient music.

The very independent researches of a competent authority, M. Gevaerts, the successor of Fétis at the Brussels Conservatoire, do not seem to have been used. The theory of the use of the Greek accents in pronunciation is ingenious, but leaves one point to unsettle and disturb. “Those who know Greek well, *as it is taught in the schools*, have little to learn from the accents, for they have gained a sound knowledge of the quantities of syllables and the rules of metre.” This surely needs explanation, unless Mr. Carruthers considers the so-called Quintilian's rule of stress according to the quantity of the penultimate syllable to be the same thing as pronouncing according to the quantity of all the syllables. In fact, a first reading fails to discover what our author thinks the accents really meant in any pronunciation conceivable to our modern ears. The musical part of his work, by far the greater part, is intelligible and interesting to all who know a little Greek and the elements of Gregorian chant.

¹ *The Ancient Use of the Greek Accents in Reading and Chanting; with some newly restored Greek Melodies.* By G. T. Carruthers, M.A. London: Bradbury, Agnew and Co. 1897.

POETRY.

THE little volume entitled *Fidelis and other Poems*,¹ by C. M. Gemmer, shows not merely rare powers of versification, but a genuine spring of poetic emotion. Here are verses which are certainly not common-place:

"Is the wind's voice like love's? with softest breath
Kindling new life in death,
Inviting to new joy when joy is dead."

"A Lodge in a Garden of Cucumbers" is a poem of much originality. We may in future expect something better from this new poet.

There is a faint Shakespearean echo in *The Death of Falstaff*.² The author of the poem is apparently an American. He makes use of such words as "happenings" and "location," and we are not quite in love with his diction. At the same time, he evidently possesses "the great poetic soul," and we welcome his volume as a genuine contribution to contemporary verse.

Notes on the Way,³ by John R. Sims, is a very ordinary volume of verses. There is nothing in it calling for praise or blame.

A Romance of a Rose and *Columbus*⁴ are two ambitious efforts in dramatic poetry. The author has, however, not much power of characterisation.

¹ *Fidelis and Other Poems*. By C. M. Gemmer. Westminster: A. Constable & Co.

² *The Death of Falstaff and Other Poems*. By L. M. Moore. Baltimore: Cushing and Co.

³ *Notes on the Way*. By John R. Sims. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁴ *A Romance of a Rose*. By M. S. London: Digby, Long & Co.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

Vol. CXLIX. No. 2.—FEBRUARY 1898,

THE YEAR OF SHAME.

How will the year 1897 be remembered in the annals of England? Most people would, I suppose, answer: "As the year of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee." Well, the Jubilee, as a national demonstration in honour of the revered lady who has so long and so worthily occupied the throne, was well conceived and nobly carried out, and as such it deserves to be, and will be, long remembered in history. But by a great many "Britishers" (if I may be allowed to borrow the expression of Brother Jonathan) the Jubilee was, I fear, regarded in a very different spirit. It was regarded in the Jingo spirit of self-glorification which is embodied in the celebrated toast, "*Here's to us. Who's like us?*"—as though the Jubilee were the celebration of the supremacy and triumph of the British race throughout the world. In my judgment these Chauvinists make a most profound mistake. When, years hence, the events of 1897 pass under the review of the dispassionate historian, I cannot doubt what his verdict will be. Never during the last two centuries has England been brought so low in the councils of the world, or been so false to her own traditions and the great principles of Freedom and Justice, as in this vaunted year of the Queen's Jubilee. Such, I take it, will be the verdict of history, when the excitements and passions and controversies of to-day are things of the dead past. And such verdict will, alas! be, as it seems to me, only too fully justified by the facts.

Let us make a brief retrospect. We all remember how in the year 1878 Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury returned from the Congress of Berlin and told us that they had brought with them "Peace with Honour." Well, peace had indeed been secured. But how? These great and courageous statesmen had, before going into the Congress, made two secret treaties, one with Turkey, the other

with Russia. Russia, at the conclusion of the war with Turkey, in which the freedom of Bulgaria had been won, had entered into the Treaty of San Stefano. Lord Beaconsfield and his party refused to recognise this treaty, and, in pursuance of their policy of defending "our ancient ally" the Turk and "the independence and integrity of the Turkish Empire," had set to work to undo as much as possible, and so far as they dared, all the good that had been done for freedom by the Treaty of San Stefano. But although they threatened Russia with war, in reality they "did not want to fight;" so before entering the Congress of Berlin they concluded a secret treaty with her, by which they yielded to her everything that she was specially concerned about. "It conceded all the points in advance which the English people believed that their plenipotentiaries had been making a brave struggle for at Berlin. Lord Beaconsfield had not frightened Russia into accepting the Congress on his terms. The call of the Indian troops to Malta had not done the business, nor the reserves, nor the vote of six millions. Russia had gone into the Congress because Lord Salisbury had made a secret engagement with her that she should have what she specially wanted."¹

So much for the "peace." As to the "honour," if it be honour to uphold the cause of slavery and oppression and to hand back millions of miserable Christians to the most abominable tyranny that the world has ever seen, it is honour of a kind that we need not grudge to Lord Beaconsfield among the shades, or Lord Salisbury among the living. But Lord Salisbury has recently confessed, with quite remarkable candour, that at the Berlin Congress "we put our money on the wrong horse"! What a condemnation of the policy of which he was one of the chief supporters!

Had the Treaty of San Stefano been allowed to stand, or had it been but slightly modified (as for instance by the extension of Greece and the curtailment of the unduly large Bulgaria), it is practically certain that the late war between Greece and Turkey could not have taken place. A glance at that most instructive work, *Hertslet's Map of Europe by Treaty*, will, I think, be sufficient to establish the truth of this proposition. (See vol. 1814-1891, p. 2799. Map showing territory restored to Turkey by the Treaty of Berlin.)

But more than this: had the Treaty of San Stefano been allowed to stand, some of the bloodiest of the recent Armenian massacres could never have been perpetrated; nay, it is not too much to say that there would have been no Armenian massacres at all, because the position and policy of Russia would have been very different if she had been allowed to retain the Armenian territory assigned to her by the Treaty of San Stefano, and if she had not been thwarted as far as possible, and as far as they dared, by Lords Beaconsfield and Salisbury at the Congress of Berlin.

¹ Justin McCarthy, *History of Our Own Times*, vol. iv. ch. lxx.

By the Treaty of San Stefano Russia had "made Turkey promise for all the area inhabited by the Armenian race and religion that the Porte would reform its government, and would secure them against the violence of the semi-savage tribes of Circassians and Kurds." Russia would thus have secured a protectorate over the Armenians, and, being in possession of Batoum and Kars, she was in a position to enforce her rights. For this protectorate Lord Beaconsfield insisted upon substituting "the Concert of Europe." This change, as the Duke of Argyll well says, "wounded the pride and the most justifiable ambition of Russia to be the protector of her co-religionists in provinces with which no other Christian Power had any natural connection. On the other hand, it delighted the low cunning of the Turk in constituting another 'rift within the lute,' which, by-and-by, would be quite sure to 'make the music mute' of any effective concert between the Powers of Europe."

Moreover, the Treaty of San Stefano took from Turkey and assigned to Russia a large portion of Asiatic territory in what is known as "Armenia," including the important town of Bayazid, where one of the worst of the massacres took place. This territory was, owing to the malign influence and infatuated policy of Lord Beaconsfield at the Congress of Berlin, once more given over to the tender mercies of the Sultan. It is in great part owing to the resentment and suspicion on the part of Russia engendered by this miserable policy that she has of late refused to interfere on behalf of the unhappy Armenians.

Let us for a moment cast our eyes still further back. In 1854 occurred that fatal and disastrous blunder known as the Crimean War. The contest in the Crimea engrossed all our military power, and we had none to spare for the defence of the Asiatic provinces of Turkey. What we did instead was to send General Williams, afterwards known as "the Hero of Kars," with some other British officers, to organise the defensive operations of the Turks. That illustrious man denounced the whole machinery of Turkish government as "an engine of tyranny perhaps unequalled in the world," and of the Turkish police he wrote: "No language can portray the infamy which characterises the life and character of this body of men." "It is sickening," writes the Duke of Argyll, "to remember that, but for our intervention under the splendid soldier who wrote these lines, the Armenian provinces of Turkey would at that time have been easily subdued by Russia. The tide of her conquests was rolled back by the brilliant defence of Kars achieved by General Williams, and but for him, representing the British Government and people, those fertile but unhappy lands would undoubtedly—more than forty years ago—have been relieved from a Government 'the infamy' of whose instruments he declared that no language

¹ Duke of Argyll, *Our Responsibilities for Turkey*, p. 70. • •

could portray." Great assuredly is the responsibility which rests upon this country for these things.

Now, by the Treaty of Paris in 1856, at the end of the Crimean War, Turkey gave a solemn promise to introduce effective reforms into Armenia. Needless to say that promise was made only to be broken. It was solemnly renewed in 1878 by the Treaty of Berlin (Art. 61), and not only so, but, as before mentioned, previously to entering the Congress of Berlin, Lord Beaconsfield's Government had concluded a secret treaty with Turkey, as well as the secret treaty with Russia to which I have already alluded. This Turkish treaty, generally known as the Anglo-Turkish or Cyprus Convention, bears title: "*Convention of Defensive Alliance between Great Britain and Turkey with respect to the Asiatic Provinces of Turkey.*" By this Convention—"an insane convention," as it was well called by Mr. Gladstone at the time—England engaged to defend Turkey by force of arms in the event of any attempt on the part of Russia to take possession of further Turkish territories in Asia, and "*in return*" the Sultan "*promised to England to introduce necessary reforms, to be agreed upon later between the two Powers, into the Government, and for the protection of the Christian and other subjects of the Porte in these territories.*" And "*in order to enable England to make necessary provision for executing her engagement,*" the Sultan assigned the island of Cyprus to be occupied and administered by this country.

Therefore, if words mean anything, England, which has since retained the island of Cyprus, was surely bound to see that Turkey carried out her part of the compact by introducing the stipulated reforms—bound in honour, if not by the strict letter of the law, at least not to allow the Christian subjects of the Turk in Asia, for whose good government England had exacted solemn and special promises from the Porte, to be barbarously massacred without lifting a finger in their behalf. Lord Rosebery, indeed, thinks that the Cyprus Convention was dead from the beginning, since Turkey never did anything towards carrying out her share in it. I could understand this argument if the question were whether or not we were bound under the convention to give assistance to the Sultan in the case of a Russian invasion. The answer would be an emphatic negative. But why should the Sultan's default absolve us from our obligations, voluntarily undertaken, on behalf of the unhappy Armenians?¹ How well one remembers the pæans which were

¹ Lord Kimberley, who was Foreign Secretary in the Rosebery Ministry, apparently differed altogether from his chief as to the value of the Cyprus Convention. In March 1896 he says: "Rustem Pasha asked me on what grounds we based our right to interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey. I expressed some astonishment at the inquiry, as I said I thought he must be aware that, *as regards the Armenians, we had the most plain and undoubted right, based upon the Treaty of Berlin and the Cyprus Convention of 1878; and not only had we, in common with the other Powers, a right to interfere, but these treaties laid upon us most serious obligations that we could not neglect.*"

sung over the Convention by the Tory party in the House of Commons! The speech of Lord Sandon, then a member of the Tory Government, is fresh in my mind. He had often, he said, wandered in these Armenian provinces, and the question always asked him by the wretched inhabitants was "When are you coming?" Well, said the speaker, we are coming now; and he painted before his enraptured audience (though haply, as the Latin Grammar says, "there were some who laughed"!) a roseate picture of the peace and prosperity which England was about to spread among these down-trodden people, even specifying the steam-plough as one of the blessings of civilisation which we were shortly to introduce into Asia Minor. And he concluded an eloquent and much-applauded speech by this felicitous quotation :

"Such honour peace to happy Britain brings;
'These are imperial works, and worthy kings!'"

Such and so great having been the promise, what has been the performance? Alas! nothing and worse than nothing. The secret treaty, and the grabbing of the island of Cyprus, increased tenfold the suspicion with which Continental Governments already regarded our foreign policy; and that, and our retention of the utterly useless island, are the sole remaining results of this much-vaunted Convention. We might laugh at Lord Sandon's steam-ploughs, if we were not constrained to weep at the unspeakable horrors that have passed before our eyes. For "the Armenian massacres," as Mr. Gladstone wrote to the Duke of Westminster, "judiciously interspersed with intervals of breathing-time, have surpassed in their scale, and in the intensity and diversity of their wickedness, all modern, if not all historical experience." And "all this was done under the eyes of the six Powers, who were represented by their Ambassadors, and who thought their feeble verbiage a sufficient counterpoise to the instruments of death, shame, and torture, provided that in framing it they all chimed in with one and another"!

A story is told of Lord Melbourne, that once, on the breaking up of a Cabinet Council wherein an important matter had been discussed, he thus addressed his fellow-Ministers: "Now, what is it that we are going to say? It doesn't matter a damn what we say, but it is just as well that we should all say the same thing"! A similar rule seems to prevail in what has been grotesquely called "the Cabinet of Europe." It "does not matter a damn" what they say, the only thing of importance is that they should all say the same thing! This is "the Concert of Europe" which has been extolled by that very pompous and grandiloquent young man, Mr. George Nathaniel Curzon, as "the modern Arcopagus," the great international High Court of Justice (save the mark!) which is to carry out the decrees of European diplomacy and statesmanship.

It is indeed an extraordinary thing that there should exist in Europe, in this latter end of the nineteenth century, supported by the Powers of Europe, owing its continued existence to those Powers, a semi-barbarous Mohammedan empire, part and parcel of whose very scheme and method of government it is to massacre its Christian subjects whenever, in pursuance of its inhuman policy, it deems it advisable so to do; and not only to massacre, but to massacre with every conceivable, or inconceivable, accompaniment of cruelty, torture, and outrage! And it is upon our own country beyond all others that the responsibility for this state of things must rest; for, as the Duke of Argyll writes, "Turkey could not have existed for a single year if we had not been her patron and protector."

Yet the sacred and infallible Six, the Concert of Europe, the Cabinet of the Powers, the International Areopagus, the Conclave of Christianity, assert (and it seems to be the only thing that they are agreed about) that the life of this Frankenstein is sacred; his empire is not to be touched, and not a little finger is to be lifted to coerce him!

Of the details of the Armenian massacres there is happily no need to speak. They belong to the facts of history, established by irrefragable evidence—evidence which is embodied in the reports of Ambassadors and Consuls, and other impartial witnesses, whose testimony nobody has ventured to impeach. One hundred thousand Armenians, men, women, and children, have been done to death in cold blood and, generally, with tortures so inconceivably horrible and sickening that it is almost impossible to read, and quite impossible to speak, of their sufferings. At least as many more have perished miserably from cold and destitution amid the rigours of winter in the Armenian highlands. And these inhuman massacres, as it has been abundantly proved, were actually planned and instigated by the Sultan himself, the Great Assassin, "Abdul the damned on his infernal throne." Nor have his atrocities been confined to remote Asiatic regions, for with appetite merely whetted by the blood which had deluged the Armenian provinces, and absolutely secure of interference by the Christian Powers of Europe, this monster then proceeded to plan and carry out the slaughter of his Armenian subjects in the very streets of Constantinople, and under the very eyes of the Ambassadors of the sacred Six.

On September 30 and October 1, 1895, some hundreds of defenceless and unoffending Armenians were brutally murdered in Constantinople by Turkish police and softas. On October 5, 1895, the British Ambassador wrote to Lord Salisbury that the bodies of these poor creatures showed that "death was inflicted with frightful violence." Women and children were amongst the murdered, and our Ambassador gave some horrible details which it is not necessary

to repeat.¹ The outrage was so great, the crime so impudent, as well as so horrible, that it was thought by many that England must now at last be moved from her position of impotent *laissez-faire*. Now if ever was her opportunity. "If," wrote the Constantinople correspondent of the *Speaker*, "Lord Salisbury had ordered the fleet to Constantinople at that time, it would have come here without firing a gun, and would have been followed by the other fleets. There were some six weeks when this was possible. . . . If I had been the only person who recommended this action at the time, or if I were alone in asserting now that he ought to have acted then, I should be silent; but I know that this opinion was held then, and is held now, by persons whose official position entitles them to be heard; and I do not think that any Ambassador in Constantinople questions the fact that the British fleet might have come here last October (1895) without serious opposition."²

But the British fleet is not to be used against "our ancient ally." Forbid it Kaiser, forbid it Czar! forbid it every Ashmead Bartlett in the kingdom! So nothing was done, and the Sultan, seeing that he was given *carte blanche*, once more set to work at his congenial task of murder in the Armenian provinces. An organised massacre took place at Trebizond. As Consul Longworth reported: "It was a planned attack. The troops took a prominent part in the butchery. At five different parts of the town the slaughter commenced almost simultaneously, and this on the sound of a trumpet from the minaret of a mosque near the Government House." This was followed by the horrors of Erzeroum (where the Consul "witnessed the burial of 309 bodies, women and children amongst them, in one large grave"), Baiburt, Gurun, and other places. Then once more it became the turn of the capital to be the scene of slaughter. Another object-lesson was to be given by the triumphant Assassin to the impertinent and interfering Giaours. In the last days of August 1896 some 6,000 unhappy Armenians were butchered in the streets of Constantinople under circumstances of appalling cruelty and brutality, and without distinction of age or sex. Thus, to give one incident only among these horrors, the *Times* correspondent wrote that 45 women and children who had sought refuge on the roof of a house were discovered, and all ruthlessly put to death, their bodies being thrown into the street.

And now surely something was done by the Concert of Europe? Yes, verily: after these horrible crimes committed under their very eyes at the instigation of the Sultan, the Ambassadors of the august Six felt that for once they must take a serious step. They did not indeed withdraw, and refuse to hold any more dealings with the vile Assassin of Yildiz Kiosk, but they agreed upon

¹ See Parliamentary Papers. Turkey, No. 2, 1896. Nos. 30, 43, 50.

² The *Speaker*, October 24, 1896, cited by Mr. Ferris. *The Eastern Crisis and British Policy*, p. 86.

a demonstration which should convince him of their displeasure. It was indeed a negative demonstration, but as coming from the Concert of Europe it was as much as—nay, more than—we had a right to expect. The Ambassadors refused to illuminate their embassies in honour of the anniversary of Abdul Hamid's accession! This is said to have come as a cruel shock to the Sultan, who is reported to have been "greatly moved."

And all this time what had been done by the Government of the greatest naval Power in the world? Everybody knows the answer. *Nothing.* Lord Salisbury indeed made a valiant speech in which he devoted the Sultan to the vengeance of Providence. Lord Salisbury is said to be a man of the best intentions, and, if there be anything in the well-worn saying of the old lexicographer, it is certain that when the ruler of Yildiz Kiosk has descended to the place whereunto it is generally supposed that great criminals are relegated after death he will find the pavement largely composed of the Prime Minister's "good intentions." Perhaps it will be a comfort to him. But, in this world, good intentions that bear no fruit are of but little use. They are but as the leaves of the barren fig-tree. Lord Salisbury pathetically declared that England was impotent in this matter. We could not, he explained, send the British fleet across the mountains of the Taurus range to protect the Armenians! The remark is so curiously fatuous that I imagine Lord Salisbury, when he made it, was laughing in his sleeve. If we were unfortunately at war with France we could not send the British fleet to Paris, but that would be an odd argument against making use of it at all! The fact is, as the *Spectator* wrote, in its comments on the Mansion House speech of November 10, 1896, "there is not a Government in the world so exposed to maritime attack as that of Turkey. If we can pass the Dardanelles we can, as Mr. Gladstone showed years ago, cleave the empire in two; and if we cannot pass the Dardanelles, port after port—Salonica, Alexandretta, Smyrna, Jeddah—lies absolutely at our mercy." And it may be remembered that by the threat of blockading Smyrna Mr. Gladstone in 1880 brought the Sultan to his senses, and compelled him to carry out one of the unfulfilled engagements of the Treaty of Berlin. The Taurus range, it need hardly be said, bears no more relation to our non-intervention on behalf of the unhappy Armenians than does Tenterden steeple to the Goodwin Sands. The fact is that Czar and Kaiser had not given their permission, and it was feared that any independent action of England, in pursuance of treaty rights and on behalf of outraged humanity, might conceivably lead to war, though how, or why, or between what States, it is exceedingly difficult to imagine. Thus did Lord Salisbury, as usual, "let I dare not wait upon I would," and Englishmen, passive spectators of these appalling crimes—of the extermination, in cold blood and of set

purpose, of an ancient race whose protection we had solemnly taken upon ourselves—could only bow the head in silence and in shame.

“Oh, heartless men of Europe, Goth or Gaul,
The brand of burning shame is on you all, all!”

But now, lest it be thought that I write on party lines only, which is far from being the case, let me call attention to the action taken in October 1896 by the then leader of the Liberal party. Undoubtedly the feature of the autumn of 1896 was the political suicide of Lord Rosebery. The facts were enough to make the angels weep. Let me briefly recall them. The agitation caused by the news of the Armenian horrors was at a white heat. It was being conducted on broad lines irrespective of party. Public meetings were held throughout the country, not to criticise the policy of the Government, but with the avowed purpose of strengthening Lord Salisbury's hands. Liberals and Conservatives met on the same platform to express the indignation which all honest men felt in common, and to assure the Prime Minister of their support in any action which he might take against the unparalleled miscreant of Yildiz Kiosk. Mr. Gladstone, induced to come forth from his retirement in order to denounce these tremendous crimes, had just made his noble and eloquent but strictly temperate speech at Liverpool, at a meeting convened by Lord Derby in his capacity of Mayor, and with the Tory Member of Parliament, Sir A. Forwood, as supporter of the resolution moved by the illustrious statesman, of whom it may truly be said that “age cannot wither him nor custom stale.” And now it was hoped that Lord Salisbury, with a united nation at his back, would take heart of grace to find some means of upholding the honour of England. This was the moment chosen by Lord Rosebery to resign the leadership of the Liberal party; this was the moment when he thought it wise and opportune to proclaim from the housetops the impotence of England, and to announce to the world that he would “fight tooth and nail” against any form of separate action whatsoever on behalf of honour and humanity and treaty rights! Lord Rosebery alleged his fear of war in justification of this extraordinary course. He feared, it seems, that the courageous, the rash, the impulsive Lord Salisbury might take decisive action. It was necessary to preach prudence and restraint to this impetuous and warlike statesman, lest haply he should bring upon us the wrath of Kaiser and of Czar!—lest he should “cry ‘Havoc,’ and let slip the dogs of war”! But Lord Salisbury was at the Foreign Office, and, with all the information at his command, he knew the dangers of the situation far better than Lord Rosebery. Moreover, as Lord Rosebery was well aware, the Prime Minister is (speaking seriously) the very last man in the world to underestimate these or any other dangers. The idea of crying “Prudence” to

Lord Salisbury is indeed comic. Nobody doubts Lord Rosebery's sincerity, but what shall we say of his wisdom? Giving him the most ample credit for heart, what are we to think of his head? In my humble judgment, and I believe it to be the judgment of the vast majority of Radicals, no more unwise, no more unstatesmanlike speech was ever made by an ex-Minister of the Crown than this Edinburgh oration. Fully as we recognise the great service which Lord Rosebery has rendered to Liberalism, we feel, after this performance, that it will be impossible for us in the future to put confidence in him as a leader of the Liberal party. He was thought to be strong in his foreign policy, and it is just there that he has lamentably failed.

Nor is it on account of the Edinburgh speech only that I say this. The results of that speech were indeed disastrous. It was as though a fog and a frost had fallen upon us. The Liberal party was cleft in twain: The Armenian agitation was paralysed. It was giving *carte blanche* to the Great Assassin. It was the triumph of the policy (if policy it can be called) of drift and impotence and despair. Such were the consequences of the imaginary dangers of a phantasmal war. But this unfortunate speech has made it the more necessary to examine Lord Rosebery's own policy with regard to the Armenian massacres, which it must be remembered commenced many months before he resigned office. What he did may be briefly stated. He got the Sultan to appoint a Turkish Commission of Inquiry into the truth of the massacres whereof he had already ample and trustworthy evidence in the consular reports, which, by the way, were systematically suppressed by his Government. This was like appointing a criminal to inquire into the truth of his own crimes. The facts as to this absurd Commission were truly remarkable. On November 23, 1894, Sir Philip Currie wired to Lord Kimberley, "The appointment of the Commission has been officially notified in the press. The notice states that the Commission has been sent to inquire into the criminal conduct of Armenian brigands, and denies absolutely the truth of the massacres." The same telegram intimates that the Ottoman Government had conferred decorations on the Mufti of Mush and Zekki Pasha, two notorious instigators and leaders of the outrages. This was a deliberate insult offered to Europe, and especially to England. To join in such a Commission after it had been thus publicly announced that the facts as to which it was to inquire had no existence, that the Armenian outrages had been invented, as the Sultan expressed it, "by certain organs of the European press," and that the only criminals were the Armenians themselves, was merely to accept humiliation and to court ignominious failure. Italy consulted her own dignity by at once withdrawing from all participation in the mock Commission, and proceeded to make independent and valuable investigations on

her own account. The British Government protested indeed, but nevertheless meekly sent a representative, to attend the inquiry which they knew was but an infamous imposture. What else did Lord Rosebery's Government do, after wasting many precious months on this miserable sham Commission? They drew up an elaborate scheme of reforms for Armenia which was quite unworkable, even if there had been any chance of getting the Sultan to attempt to carry it into effect. It is a poor record indeed.

Lord Rosebery's Government has been further and severely criticised by the Duke of Argyll and Canon McCall because they did not at the outset endeavour to come to a frank understanding with Russia. Upon this charge, however, I think an impartial jury must, on the facts that have been made known to the public, return a verdict of "not proven." Russia's policy, as directed by Prince Lobanoff, appears to me simply detestable in its cynical selfishness and its absolute indifference to human suffering. How different from the policy of the great and good Czar who fought for and won the freedom of Bulgaria! We must, however, remember the suspicion and resentment engendered by the Cyprus Convention and by Lord Beaconsfield's action at Berlin. It is curious, however, that both the Duke of Argyll and Canon McCall have founded a direct charge against Lord Rosebery's Government of neglecting their opportunities of coming to an understanding with Russia, upon a garbled quotation from the papers presented to Parliament. On March 13, 1895, our Ambassador at St. Petersburg, Sir Frank Lascelles, had a conversation with the Russian Chancellor on the subject of the troubles in Armenia. "It is remarkable," writes the Duke of Argyll, "that he was at once met more than halfway. Prince Lobanoff told him that he had never trusted in the results of a Turkish inquiry, and that *'in his opinion, the most important question to be considered was, What was to be done when the Commission should have concluded its labours? and he sincerely hoped some practical suggestion would be made.'*" The reference given is to *Turkey*, No. 1 (1895), Part. I. No. 179. Observe the supposed quotation which I have thrown into italics. This is represented by the Duke as a direct overture from Prince Lobanoff to Lord Rosebery's Government. To the like effect writes Canon McColl, who quotes, and, as I shall presently show, *misquotes*, Sir Frank Lascelles' despatch in exactly the same way as does the Duke of Argyll. And he proceeds to make this comment: "That was a straightforward invitation to the British Government to come to terms with Russia in regard to Armenia. What was the response? A rebuff of silence."

Now will it be believed that both these high critics have actually left out an important sentence in making their pretended quotation? Our Ambassador's despatch runs: "His Excellency (Prince Lobanoff) replied that he had never entertained much hope of a satisfactory

result, and he doubted whether the perpetrators of the Sasun massacres would be brought to justice. In his opinion, however, the most important question to be considered was what was to be done when the Commission should have concluded its labours. *His Excellency had been glad to learn from M. de Nelidoff that he had already been in consultation with Sir Philip Currie on the subject, and he sincerely hoped some practical suggestion would be made.*" Thus by the simple expedient of omitting a sentence of vital importance, what was really a reference to a discussion already proceeding at Constantinople is represented as a direct overture from Russia to the British Government. A pious hope that M. de Nelidoff and Sir Philip Currie would hit upon some practical suggestion is made to do duty as "a straightforward invitation" from the Russian Chancellor to Lord Rosebery to "come to terms with Russia in regard to Armenia"! The Duke of Argyll's mistake was pointed out some time ago, but so far as I know the fact that Canon McColl mutilates the quotation in exactly the same way has passed unnoticed. How is this strange similarity to be accounted for? We know that "great wits jump," but it can hardly be supposed that we have here merely a fortuitous coincidence of error. It would rather seem that one must have copied from the other without taking the trouble to refer to the despatch itself. It is an extraordinary instance of (no doubt unintentional) misrepresentation, and the moral is "always verify your quotations"!

But there is one observation which may, I think, justly be made with regard to England's behaviour towards Russia at this crisis. Surely the right course would have been for the English Government to have approached Russia frankly and in a friendly spirit; to have told her candidly that the provisions in the Cyprus Convention which bound us to assist the Sultan by force of arms in the event of Russia sending troops into Turkish Armenia were dead; that we frankly renounced them; and that we invited her to resume her protectorate of the Armenian Christians, to send her battalions into the unhappy country, and to annex what territory she pleased. Russia was suspicious of our intentions. She announced that she would not have another autonomous independent Bulgaria on her Asiatic frontier; and in this she was quite right. The proposal to convert what is called "Armenia" into an independent autonomous kingdom would be an absurdity. If we could only have convinced Russia of our sincerity, of our disinterestedness, of our frank renunciation of the old disastrous policy; if we had urged her, the only Power that was in a position to interfere effectually, to go in and settle the question in her own way and "off her own bat" (if I may be allowed a popular expression), I cannot but think that the whole situation might have been changed, and Europe might have been spared the shame and sorrow and calamity which have fallen upon

it. It is to be deplored that neither by Lord Rosebery nor Lord Salisbury was this course taken.

All this has already become "ancient history" in the eyes of opportunist politicians; but I dwell upon it because without a proper appreciation of these facts it is impossible to understand the present position of affairs. It is indeed distressing to behold the levity with which the public is apt to dismiss from their minds, and consign to oblivion, events over which the shadow of but a few years has fallen. Absorbed in the excitement and controversies of to-day, they are impatient of those who bid them draw lessons for to-morrow from the experience of yesterday. But history is but past politics, and only by a study of the past are we enabled to form a just judgment on present questions, or to make a trustworthy forecast of the future. If "coming events cast their shadows before," it is equally certain that past events shed light upon what is to come.

But now the scene shifts. Now we have no longer to deal with remote and little-known Asiatic regions. Now it is not with rugged Armenian highlands that we are concerned, but with Greece and the Isles of Greece. And now we enter upon the record of the Year of Shame.

The glories of the classical Greece make the land of the Hellenes for ever interesting in our eyes. But let us, as far as possible, dismiss all such merely sentimental considerations from our minds. Suffice it here to recall that in the year 1453, when the Sultan Mohammed II. made himself master of Constantinople, Greece fell under the blighting rule of the Ottoman Turk, and for nearly four centuries the Greeks were oppressed and degraded by that abominable and withering tyranny. But in 1821 the Greeks began the great war by which, after nine long years of struggle and suffering and self-sacrifice, they finally won their independence. But gallantly as they fought and nobly as they struggled, they would hardly have been able to achieve this great result unaided. We may be glad to remember that for once this country, not then blinded by the fatuous policy of upholding the "independence and integrity of the Turkish Empire," cast her influence into the scale of freedom, and was largely instrumental in securing the deliverance of at least a portion of the Hellenic race.

In the year 1827 we had fortunately *a man* at the head of affairs in this country—a man of strong will who knew his own mind; a man who was brave not in word only, who did not, like Lord Salisbury, "let I dare not wait upon I would," but who was prepared to follow up decisive speech by equally decisive action. I allude, of course, to the illustrious statesman George Canning.

George Canning at least was no sentimental Radical. He was a Tory, but nevertheless a man of enlightened views, of liberal mind, and of wide sympathies. He perceived that the establishment and

recognition by Europe of a Greek kingdom was a policy not only dictated by every consideration of justice and humanity, but also in the highest degree consonant with British interests. He appears to have foreseen what, unhappily, our smaller politicians of the present day have never been able to realise—that a strong and friendly Greece would be of the very greatest assistance to English interests and English trade in the Levant. Greece with her geographical position, with her indented coast, and with the many islands that belong or ought to belong to her, is eminently fitted by nature to be the seat of a strong naval power. Had Greece received fair play at the start, had she been awarded a proper and reasonable extent of territory, she might long ere this have developed resources which would have made her not only a highly prosperous country, but also a force capable of restraining the inordinate ambition of the Slav. And the friendship of such a country would have been invaluable to Great Britain. But Greece unhappily was not allowed a fair start. She was sent into the race so heavily handicapped that the only wonder is that she was able to hold her own so well. If people would only take the trouble to understand this we should, I think, hear fewer sneers at the failures and shortcomings of the Greeks.

Let us return to the historical record. Canning, having clearly recognised the wisdom and justice of putting an end to the bloody war which had so long been carried on between the Greeks and the Turks, and of establishing a Greek kingdom, at once proceeded to take the proper steps to carry out his policy. He did not appeal to "the Concert of Europe," but he conferred with France and Russia, and succeeded in obtaining their adherence to his proposal. The result was that in July 1827 a treaty was signed at London by which an arrangement was come to between these three Powers for securing self-government for Greece, though under the nominal suzerainty of the Porte; and under this treaty it is to be noticed that the "Islands of Greece" were to be given to the Greeks. Unhappily for England, unhappily for Greece, unhappily for the cause of freedom, Canning died a month after the signing of this preliminary treaty. Had he lived we cannot but believe that Greece would have been started on her career adequately equipped, and with fair chances of success. This, however, was not to be. The practical independence of Greece was indeed recognised by the Treaty of Adrianople concluded between Russia and Turkey in 1829, and by the Protocol of the Conference of London between Great Britain, France, and Russia, in February 1830, it was finally laid down that "Greece shall form an independent State, and shall enjoy all the rights, political, administrative, and commercial, attached to complete independence." But it was when the limits of the new kingdom come to be considered that the fatal mistake was made.

Undoubtedly, the Kingdom of Greece should have included all

Thessaly and Epirus up to the fortieth parallel of latitude, and indeed beyond it at Mount Olympus, and especially it should have included the island of Crete.

Motions were made in both Houses of Parliament to the effect that "no pacification or settlement of Greece will be satisfactory, or will be permanently advantageous to the interests of Europe, or honourable to England, which does not give to that country a territory sufficient for national defence and for its real development." These motions were supported by Lord Holland, Lord Melbourne, and Lord Lansdowne in the Lords, and in the Commons by Lord John Russell, Lord Palmerston, and Sir James Mackintosh. All these eminent men had the wisdom to perceive that lamentable consequences would ensue unless the kingdom of Greece were started with adequate territory, and they claimed for her the whole of Thessaly and Epirus, as well as the island of Crete. They argued (1) that without such accession of territory it was impossible that any permanent settlement could be arrived at, and that there must be a recurrence of the disturbances which had caused the intervention of the Powers; (2) that the provinces and the island were necessary for Greece and her natural defence by sea and land; (3) that these territories were equally necessary for the development of her resources; (4) that the provinces and the island should be given to Greece on the grounds of humanity and justice, because their inhabitants were Greek by race, had for many years fought for their independence, and had to a great extent already obtained it. The words of Lord Holland were indeed prophetic:—

"My lords, the day will come when we shall see the errors of which our Government have been guilty . . . when our neglect of the opportunity of adding Candia (Crete) to the territories of Greece will reflect upon ourselves with a force of which no man can see the remote consequences. However wise, however prudent, the head of the Greek Government may be . . . he must either connive at his own subjects carrying on clandestine intercourse with the insurgents in Candia, or he must openly espouse the cause of their oppressed brethren. If such be his determination, what, then, will be the consequence? A new war, which may embroil all the Powers of Europe in dispute."

Lord John Russell urged the same view, and argued that Crete was one of the "Islands of Greece" which, by the treaty of 1827, were to be given to Greece. Sir James Mackintosh said: "Candia, essential to the safety of Greece, cannot be excluded from its territory without endangering the existence of the State." Lord Palmerston said: "No man who had turned his attention to the subject could doubt that the political existence and the defence of Greece would depend on the possession of that island."

Alas! the spirit of Canning had disappeared from the counsels of

the British Government, and in its place the reactionary views of the Duke of Wellington—whose merits as a general cannot blind us to his defects as a politician—had become predominant. France and Russia were at that time willing to extend the boundaries of Greece on the mainland, and, especially, to include Crete. It was indeed a golden opportunity; but it was lost, and lost through the influence of this country. The Duke of Wellington was obstinate and obdurate. It is said that he was apprehensive as to our position in those Ionian Islands which we afterwards most properly ceded to Greece. But however that may be, as the result of his evil influence the new kingdom was maimed and crippled. Not only were Epirus and Thessaly excluded, but the Cretans also were denied the deliverance for which they had so bravely fought, and the Powers actually decided to hand over the island, not indeed to the Sultan, but to his vassal, Mehemet Ali, the Egyptian Pasha, who was held in abhorrence by the islanders for the savage brutality with which he had suppressed, with his African troops, one of their numerous risings against the tyranny of the Turk.

It was under these circumstances that the Powers offered the crown of Greece to a man who subsequently acquired the reputation of being the wisest ruler of his generation—Prince Leopold, afterwards King of the Belgians. He refused the offer, and stated his reasons to the Duke of Wellington in most remarkable words—words as prophetic as those of Lord Holland, and which have been realised to the letter: "I am afraid that the hidden interest which caused this separation to be determined will augur no good to the new State. The exclusion of Candia (Crete) will cripple the Greek State both morally and physically, will make it weak and poor, and expose it to constant danger from the Turks, and create from the beginning innumerable difficulties for him who is to be at the head of the Government, because Greece will never be made to understand and appreciate the exclusion of Candia, and out of this circumstance alone a perpetual source of irritation will flow. Other effects not less dangerous to the tranquillity of the new State must arise from the same cause. For is it likely that the Greeks, henceforth in an improved position, should slacken in their sympathy for their countrymen and fellow-Christians? Or is it more likely that the Candiotcs, with the accomplishment of the Greek cause before their eyes, should forget that they are Greeks themselves? For what am I to infer from these propositions for the entire pacification of Candia, a point of the greatest moment to the Greek Government? Certainly not grounds of confidence that its inhabitants will peaceably return under the Turkish dominion. And what mode of pacification will then remain? In my opinion, *nothing but the force of arms.*"

Alas! that such wise words should have fallen upon deaf and

obstinate ears! Thus did England become responsible for the handing back of the Cretans to the miseries of Turkish misrule.

Crete, lying in the blue Mediterranean almost within sight of Athens, is, as Lord John Russell pointed out to Parliament, one of the "Isles of Greece"—those lovely isles girt by lovely seas of which Byron sung—the poet who lost his life in the cause of Greek independence :

"There, mildly dimpling Ocean's cheek,
Reflects the tints of many a peak,
Caught by the laughing tides that lave
These Edens of the Eastern wave.

* * * * *

So soft the scene, so formed for joy,
So curst the tyrants that destroy."

For more than two centuries, viz., since 1669, Crete has been oppressed by the Ottoman Turk. Her history has been a history of martyrdom and misery long drawn out. It has been a history of oppression and massacre on the part of the Turk, and of most righteous rebellions on the part of the islanders. Ten times within the present century have they been driven to revolt by the intolerable tyranny of their oppressors. And in all their many risings their demand has ever been the same. They have never failed to proclaim their desire and their determination to be united with Greece. Crete is in truth bound to Greece by every tie of race, of history, of sentiment, and of geographical position.

The Cretans fought bravely in the war of Greek independence, and on the plain of Phalerum, within sight of Athens, may be seen the tomb of 200 Cretans who fought in that war under the English leader, General Sir Richard Church, and who died to a man refusing to surrender to the Turk. At the close of the war the Cretans had practically won, as they had entirely deserved, their independence, and to force them back under the sway of a savage Egyptian Pasha was an act of surpassing cruelty as well as of surpassing folly. Yet for this act England is, as I have already shown, mainly responsible. Crete was handed over to Mehemet Ali, and remained under his sway till his rebellion against the Porte in 1840, after which the island was once more given over by the Powers to the Sultan of Turkey. Such is the humanity, such the wisdom, which inspire the counsels of the Concert of Europe!

In February 1841 the Cretans again rose in rebellion against their oppressors. They were for a time victorious, and once more they proclaimed their union with Greece. They were beaten down, but again they rose in 1858, and in 1866 broke out the great and bloody insurrection noted even among Cretan risings for its tales of horror and suffering and inextinguishable bravery, and which was not finally put down till 1869. At the beginning of the rising, on August 21, 1866, the islanders thus addressed the Consuls of the

three Powers: "Crete if united to Greece would confer great advantages on the whole Greek race, and would be able to embark on a system of civilisation. If the creation of an Hellenic kingdom had for its object the regeneration of this people, Crete, which is a purely Hellenic country, should become one of its foundation-stones."

Count Bismarck in the same year told the British Ambassador at Berlin that "if England would assist in obtaining the cession of Crete to Greece, all present difficulties in the East would be at once arranged." All this was to no purpose. The Powers in 1869 forced the unhappy islanders to accept the terms of the Turkish ultimatum, and contented themselves with exacting from the Sultan a worthless promise of reforms. But in 1877 war was declared by Russia against Turkey, and the Cretans naturally availed themselves of the opportunity to throw off their intolerable yoke. In January 1878 they again took up arms, and again proclaimed their union with Greece. They had already cleared the interior of Turkish troops when, Turkey being now hard pressed, some of the Powers intervened immediately after the Treaty of San Stefano, and induced the Cretans to agree to a truce. On May 25 the Cretan Assembly addressed to the British Consul a memorandum, declaring their unshaken resolve to obtain union with Greece. They also memorialised the Berlin Congress to the same effect, setting forth their grievances and concluding with the following words:

"By the above recital we hope to persuade the representatives of the Powers that Crete can never enjoy tranquillity for any length of time, nor ever prosper, if her hopes and her most ardent desires be not fulfilled—if, namely, she be not reunited to Greece, to which country she is bound by indissoluble ties."

But Crete and Greece were betrayed by the Powers at the Berlin Congress, betrayed especially by the representatives of England, and there is, unhappily, but little doubt that the abandonment of the claims of Greece was part of the price paid by Lord Beaconsfield to Turkey for the island of Cyprus and the "insane Convention!"¹ The Congress did indeed make certain recommendations for the rectification of the Greek boundaries, which if they had been carried out would have given to Greece an important extension of territory (including the town of Janina) and would have substituted a defensible for an indefensible frontier.

"A conference between the representatives of Greece and Turkey was held at Prevesa early in 1879, at which the Turks tried to set aside the Berlin basis, and this was adjourned to Constantinople later in the year, where the Commissioners sat from August till November. But it ended

¹ See *Papers of the Greek Committee* (New Series, 1897. No. 1. Crete and Greece). These papers are issued under the high sanction of the Duke of Westminster, the most important member of the Committee. One cannot help wondering what the Duke thinks of the Unionist foreign policy.

in a deadlock, the Turks refusing to accept the Berlin frontier. The Powers then came to the rescue, and there was a Conference in Berlin in 1880, at which the frontier line was settled in substantial accord with the decision of the Congress."¹

But it is one thing for the Powers to tell the Sultan what he is to do, and quite another thing to get him to do it. The Porte remained recalcitrant. It declared that it was quite impossible to carry out the decision of the Conference. "The Powers replied with much solemnity that the line settled by Europe could not be reconsidered. The decision of the Conference must be adhered to; and they recommended it to the Sublime Porte as being in conformity with the Treaty and Protocol of Berlin. Turkey, however, remaining obdurate, the Concert's next business was to eat its own words, and throw the whole question once more into the melting-pot. It was decided 'to arbitrate,' and the German Government were requested by the British Government to submit a proposal on the subject. Germany did so, and after the usual palavers between the Powers, her frontier line was virtually accepted, and Turkey, with the exception of Larissa, won her points. The Sultan was well paid for flouting Europe, and so far as Greece was concerned it may be said that he tore up the Berlin Treaty, Germany and the other Powers conniving. Is it surprising when the Powers admonish Greece of the sanctity of treaties that she listens with some amount of scepticism?"

Let us now pass rapidly over recent events. The Sultan had solemnly promised to introduce reforms into the Government of Crete—he is ever ready to make such promises—and *on paper* something had been done to carry them out; but these paper reforms were, of course, worth no more than the word of the Great Assassin, and the Turkish word has not even the value of the Turkish bond! In consequence of continued misrule the island was continually on the verge of insurrection. But the Powers intervened, apprehensive for the peace of Europe! and obtained from the Sultan—more promises. But the Turk was laughing in his sleeve. He was resolved upon his course, and it was "the good old rule and simple plan"—massacre! Our Government had received ample warning of the coming storm. On March 7, 1896, the British Consul at Canea sent a full account of the situation to Lord Salisbury, and added:

"All these details are certainly known at Constantinople, but nothing is done to find a remedy for a state of things which, before long, must fatally lead to a general outbreak and disorder which may exceed even those of the year 1889. By its utter inaction the Sublime Porte rather seems to court such a result. The Mussulmans telegraphed to the Sultan himself complaining of the situation; but no heed seems to have been taken of the request."²

¹ See special article on the Græco-Turkish Frontier: "How Turkey Defied Europe," *Daily Chronicle*, April 16, 1897.

² Turkey, No. 7 (1896), p. 59.

Complete anarchy reigned in the island. But the Sultan while promising reform was preparing measures after his own heart, and judging the time ripe in May 1896, he gave the signal, and on the 24th of that month a preconcerted massacre of Christians took place at Canea.

"The event sent a thrill of horror throughout Greece, and the Government of King George was urged to order the fleet to Crete. Had that measure been taken promptly and resolutely, the island would most probably have fallen into the hands of Greece without a gun being fired. The opportunity, both from a military and a political point of view, was then singularly favourable. Crete was denuded of troops, the Turks could oppose nothing to the Greek fleet, and the cause for intervention was sufficient and just. The Great Powers, however, dissuaded the Greek Government from taking action, promising that they would remedy the grievances of the Cretans. The Porte also was profuse in its promises of concessions if only Greece abstained from active measures. And the Greek Government, anxious to give a fresh proof of moderation, complied with the recommendations, and relied upon the promises made."¹

On May 27, 1896, the British Ambassador in Vienna telegraphed to Lord Salisbury :

"Moderation has been counselled by Count Goluchowski through the Austria-Hungarian representatives both at Athens and Constantinople. His Excellency, however, fears that events have gone to such lengths that an irresistible popular current may carry away the King of Greece and his Government. In his opinion, the blame for the present situation lies entirely with the Turks themselves, and it will be impossible for Greece to stand aloof if acts of savagery take place in the island; under such circumstances she would probably have much European sympathy on her part."²

But while "the Concert" was palavering, the Sultan was hurriedly landing troops in Crete. On May 28, 1896, the British chargé d'affaires at Constantinople telegraphed to Lord Salisbury: "The Turkish Government are determined to quell the insurrection in Crete by force with their customary severity." But the brave islanders had occupied the strategic positions, and they were victorious in all their encounters with the Turkish troops. Still "the Concert" talked of reforms and "autonomy"; but in February 1897 the Musulmans in Canea, directly instigated by the Sultan, massacred the Christians and set fire to their quarter of the town. Thus the island was a prey to fire and sword and outrage. Great excitement prevailed in Greece, whither, as always in time of Cretan trouble (and when has Crete been free from trouble?), tens of thousands of refugees—women, children, and helpless old men—had fled from the barbarities of the Turk. At length things came to such a pass that the Greek Government had to choose between rendering assistance to their suffering brethren in Crete on the one hand and revolution on the other. Had not the demands of the people, which were also the demands of patriotism and humanity, been complied

¹ Papers of the Greek Committee (New Series, 1897), No. 1, p. 44.

² Turkey, No. 7 (1896), p. 86.

with, there is little doubt but that King George's dynasty would have gone down.¹ Flesh and blood could endure no longer. On February 13, 1897, Colonel Vassos, aide-de-camp to the King, was despatched, with a body of troops, to "occupy the island, and re-establish order and peace"; and although the ships of the Powers were lying off the shores of Crete, the expedition was allowed to land without protest or interference.

One thing, and one thing only as it seems to me, can be justly said as to this courageous action on the part of Greece, namely, that it was absolutely and indubitably right. It is, indeed, the only bright spot in the darkness which has fallen like a pall upon Europe, obscuring the counsels of her rulers, and bringing despair to the lovers of liberty and light. Here had been the almighty "Concert" (save the mark!) wasting precious time in talking, and writing, and telegraphing to and fro, after the approved style; and now at last, amid all this wilderness of words, was *action*—the action of one plucky little State to shame the pusillanimous impotence of the Powers.

And now what should England have done? What should have been the part of the champion of freedom and the ruler of the waves? It was as clear as daylight, to all but the wilfully blind, that Crete should have been long ago annexed to Greece. England was responsible for the fact that this had not been done in 1830, sixty-seven years before. England's true policy was to help the oppressed and to uphold the flag of freedom. England's interest was altogether on the side of Greece and justice and humanity.

If we had had at that moment a *man* at the head of affairs in this country—a *man*, not a *mollusc*—a man such as the men who swayed the destinies of England in times past—a man such as Canning, or Palmerston, or Gladstone—would he not have said at once, "Though we could not send the British fleet to Armenia 'over the mountains of the Taurus,' yet this is an island in the Mediterranean Sea, and here our ships can come; here they can ride in safety. This is a portion of the Eastern Question which can well be dealt with by itself and on its own particular merits. We have been mocked and deceived by this lying Assassin, this miscreant whose hands are stained with the blood of 100,000 Armenian Christians. It is time that these things should cease. The policy of England is plain. That must be done now which ought to have been done long years ago. These islanders of Crete must be united to their fellow-countrymen of the mainland, as every consideration both of justice and expediency imperatively

¹ *Truth* has thought well to publish, in what it is pleased to call "the true story of the Turco-Greek War," some silly charges against the King of Greece, made on the authority of "a foreign diplomatist"—name not stated. The story on the face of it was in the highest degree improbable, and the *Daily Chronicle* (December 18, 1897) has effectually disposed of it. Even had it been true it would not have affected my argument.

demands. That is the policy of England, and to that end the influence, the power, the naval force of England shall be used."

If Lord Salisbury had taken such a line as this, he would have had the whole nation at his back. The matter would probably have been settled in a fortnight; a great blessing would have been conferred upon mankind, and the war and all the disasters which have followed in its train would have been avoided. Instead of this, what was the action of the Minister representing the greatest naval Power of the world? Our ships were ordered to blockade the island, in conjunction with those of the other "concerting Powers," in order that more aid might not be sent from Greece, and in order to starve the Cretans into submission to the Turk. Could humiliation sink lower? Yes, it could find a still deeper depth. On at least two occasions—in February and March 1897—British ships joined in a bombardment of the insurgent Cretans. The second occasion has become notorious owing to the part taken in it by H.M.S. *Camperdown*. The insurgents, the *Standard* correspondent tells us, notwithstanding a heavy cannonade from the other vessels, "held their ground stoutly, even throwing out skirmishers, and driving back the 'Turkish outposts'; but at ten o'clock the *Camperdown*, at a range of 6,400 yards from her moorings, opened fire with her huge barbette guns. "The effect was instantaneous, three out of four of the percussion shells bursting right in the midst of the insurgents, and causing them to run helter-skelter in all directions. The practice was perfect, while the formidable noise made by the enormous shells as they hurtled through the still air was alone enough to frighten the enemy, apart from the terrific explosions and widespread damage."

"It is pitiable," wrote the correspondent of the *Daily News*, "to see the European fleet shelling a few shepherds who are fighting for their liberty." Pitiable indeed! To my mind, in this bombardment of men fighting not only for liberty but for all that makes life worth living, we have one of the most disgraceful episodes in English history. Our sailors, of course, were bound to obey their orders, but no wonder it is reported that they hated the work—that "their heart was not in the job."

It is for this that we maintain a fleet superior to the combined fleets of all other European Powers! It is thus that in these latter times we keep alive the glorious traditions of the British Navy and preserve the memories of Nelson and Trafalgar!

"'Twas down in Suda Bay
The British squadron lay,
The fleet that ne'er was beaten,
Along our line the signal ran:
'Turkey expects each Englishman
This day will shoot a Cretan!'"

In truth the bombardment of these Cretan insurgents was of a piece with our whole course of action on the Græco-Turkish question.

In March and April 1897, when excitement was at boiling-point, some bodies of wild and uncontrollable Greek irregulars crossed the Turkish frontier. These were members of 'the notorious Ethniké Hetairia, a body which had been repeatedly denounced by the King as enemies of their country. The Greek Government, which they refused to obey, were no more responsible for their action than was the English Government for the Jameson raid.' On April 19 Turkey declared war against Greece. It seems monstrous that the blockade of Crete should still have been continued under such circumstances. Yet so it was. Our forces were thus to all intents and purposes acting in alliance with "the unspeakable Turk."

Mr. Curzon, indeed, that very superior person, is very angry if the word "alliance" is used. Well, we will not quarrel about words. Let us look at the facts. Had the blockade of Crete been discontinued, Turkey must either have been content to lose the island, or she must have sent an army corps to fight against Vassos and the insurgents. By our action, we, in company with our fellow-conspirators, liberated that army corps for action against the Greeks on the mainland, and at the same time we were preventing supplies reaching the Greek and insurgent forces on the island. It was as though two men were duelling with rapier and dagger, and I should seize and hold the dagger-arm of one of them. I fancy the free man would look upon me as his ally! And thus it was that Greece was made to embark upon the struggle with one hand tied behind her back.

Now there is one thing in all this that we should never forget. Mr. Curzon, who at any rate assumes a wisdom, though he hath it not, has called the Concert "the Cabinet of Europe." It is a silly expression; but let it pass. If the Concert be a Cabinet, there is, as is usually the case, an inner Cabinet. That inner Cabinet is the league of the Emperors. By Russia, the great head and protector of the Slav races, the idea of a strong and extended Greece is viewed with repugnance and hostility. The German Emperor, the most grotesque melodramatist on the European stage, has given abundant proof of his hatred of the Greeks. It is said that personal pique is at the bottom of it, and with such an erratic genius (genius, as we know, being nearly akin to insanity) this unworthy motive seems as likely as any other to be the true one. The Austrian Government, overweighted with the burden of keeping in harmony such discordant elements as Germans, Slavs, and Hungarians, is morbidly apprehensive of any disturbance of the *status quo*, and has cast in its lot with the other two. Moreover, both the Russian and German Governments seem to have been actuated by sentiments anything but friendly towards this country. It is clear that these three despotic

¹ This statement has lately been contradicted. The Ethniké Hetairia allege, it seems, that M. Delyannis was privy to their proceedings. In the same way the Rhodesians declared that Mr. Chamberlain was privy to the Jameson raid.

Powers joined in a conspiracy to crush democratic Greece—a conspiracy which, alas! has been only too successful. It has been proved that the Sultan was willing to come to terms with King George, but was prevented from doing so by the Czar, acting in concert, not with the Powers of Europe, but with his brother despots. And why did these three despots so relentlessly oppose the annexation of Crete to Greece? And, further, when King George intimated his willingness to accept autonomy for Crete, and to put his troops at the disposal of a general to be nominated by the Powers, provided the Cretans were allowed ultimately to choose their own Governor, why did the despots turn a deaf ear to such a reasonable proposition? Because they had resolved on the ruin of the small State that had risked its life to liberate a long-oppressed portion of the Hellenic race. Well may a writer in the *Observer* remark that the blockade of Crete, the occupation of the principal points of the coast, the bombardment of the insurgents, were the necessary corollary of the programme of the Emperors.

Thus Greece, with a brave but half-drilled and badly disciplined army, with lamentably insufficient artillery, and with, unfortunately, no trained and experienced staff officers on whom reliance could be placed, found herself confronted with an army equally brave (for nobody denies the bravery of the Turkish soldier) and numerically superior, officered, organised, and strategically directed by German officers lent by the Kaiser, a nominally neutral potentate, to the Great Assassin of Armenia! Could anything have been more unfair, more infamous?

And what has this country gained by its through thick-and-thin adherence to the Concert? It has gained nothing; it has lost everything. England has acted as the jackal of the despots of Europe. Lord Salisbury has played the part of the monkey on the organ—he has danced while Czar or Kaiser has played the tune. What a spectacle for Englishmen in the year of the Queen's Jubilee!

The League of the Emperors has had its way, and everything that Englishmen should have cared for—should have fought for, if necessary—has been sacrificed to the fetish which Lord Salisbury has set up. It seems that we must always bow down to a fetish of some sort. Yesterday it was “the independence and integrity of the Turkish Empire.” To-day it is “the Concert of Europe.” Concerted action has meant for England subservience to the sinister policy of “the inner Cabinet.” The results are indeed pitiful and such as may well fill an Englishman with indignant shame. The cause of humanity and civilisation in Eastern Europe has been put back for a generation. Greece has been brought to ruin, and it may be (though I will not believe it) has for ever lost her independence. Beaten as she was in her unequal conflict, she placed herself unreservedly in the hands of the Powers—the Powers, who had stood by like “the ring” of a prize-fight, encouraging and assisting

her adversary, and cynically waiting for the "knock-out" blow! And now a peace has been forced upon her only a little better than slavery itself. Bankrupt as she is, she has to pay an almost impossible indemnity, and to submit to have her finances controlled by a Commission appointed by the Powers. So willed the German bondholders and money-lenders, careless of anything save their pound of flesh. The Turkish soldiers are still in the devastated plains of Thessaly, and the unhappy country is to have a newly "rectified" frontier, which puts every strategic position, every mountain ridge, every southern slope, into the possession of her enemies. Yet may she find consolation in her hour of trouble. Her plucky action has not been without fruitful result; her sufferings have not been all in vain. For if Crete be ultimately delivered from the Turkish tyranny, it is to Greece and Greece alone that the islanders will owe their deliverance. That one stroke of action has won for Crete a hope which the Concert, with all its palaver, would never have extricated from the maze of diplomatic verbiage—the hope and the promise of self-government.

Nor will we again raise the dirge, "'Tis Greece, but living Greece no more." For the future is surely with her. Kaiser and Czar are not for all time, and it may be hoped that England will not for ever be ruled by invertebrate and pusillanimous politicians. The Concert has certainly prolonged the Sick Man's miserable existence. As the Great Assassin he has been given a new lease of life. But, nevertheless, his days are numbered. The eagles of Russia, Germany, and Austria are on the watch for their prey—vultures, rather, waiting till the carrion be ready for ravening beak and claw. When that hour comes we may yet hope that Greece will be ready to enter upon her inheritance. She has had a terrible lesson, but a lesson it has been; and States, like men, may rise on their dead selves to higher things.

And what of the martyr island of Crete? The unhappy Cretans have to resign their dearest hopes—hopes for which their forefathers and their brethren have

"died, alas! in vain
On many a slope and many a plain."

Union with Greece has been forbidden to them. But where is the boasted autonomy, the full self-government which the benevolent Concert has solemnly promised and vowed to establish for them? Seemingly as far off as ever. The island is in a state of anarchy, even worse, than the misery of Turkish rule.¹ And when are the Turkish troops to be expelled in accordance with the undertaking of

¹ Since these words have been put into type a pitious appeal has been made by the Metropolitan of Crete on behalf of the Christians in his unhappy island, giving a vivid picture of the horror of the present condition of the people. It is difficult to realise the frightful misery of the situation. And this is the work of the Concert of Europe! I would beg to refer to the *Daily Chronicle* of January 19, 1898.

the Concert? Apparently on the *Greek kalends*. For the Sultan, naturally exultant, naturally contemptuous of a Concert of babbling diplomatists—of Powers which will coerce a little State such as Greece, but will not, or dare not, move a little finger against the Great Assassin—opposes his stolid *non possumus* to every proposal of “the European Areopagus.” It is probable, however, that Crete will be ultimately disposed of according to the designs of “the inner Cabinet.” Crete has an excellent harbour, and it is said that the despots of Europe were suspicious of England’s designs thereon. As Russia was determined not to have another independent Bulgaria in Armenia, so also was she determined not to allow the example of Cyprus to be followed in the case of Crete. It is possible, therefore, as the *Observer* has remarked, that “John Bull may wake one morning to find Suda Bay in the hands of a hostile Power lying athwart his route to Egypt and India.”¹ But even in such case, I presume, Lord Salisbury would shrink from “isolated action,” and Mr. Curzon would discourse superbly to the admiring Commons on the blessings of an European Areopagus!

So much for the Tories, with their heaven-sent Foreign Minister. But now, since, as I have already said, I do not write merely on party lines, let us for a moment glance at the action of the Parliamentary leaders of the Liberal party. What was the conduct of the Front Opposition Bench? They had a splendid opportunity. We know well how Mr. Gladstone would have made use of it had he been still as in the days of the Midlothian campaign. The fire of his eloquence would have kindled the land throughout its length and breadth, “from Eddystone to Berwick bounds, from Lynn to Milford bay.” With what irresistible force would he have led the agitation aroused by the Armenian horrors! And when the question of Crete arose, when the news of the blockade of the island and the bombardment of the insurgents by her Majesty’s ships was brought home, how would his burning indignation and his remorseless logic have torn the Salisbury-Curzon policy to shreds and tatters! The Liberal party throughout the country was waiting only for the call to arms. It was looking eagerly for the action of its Parliamentary leaders. Great, indeed, was the opportunity; but the Front Opposition Bench seemed incapable of rising to the occasion. The generals sulked in their tents, leaving private soldiers to carry on the conflict as best they might. “Oh for an hour of Gladstone!” was the cry; but the kindling voice was heard no more within the walls of Parliament, and the failure of the Front Opposition Bench is unfortunately one of the facts that have to be noted in the record of the year 1897.

And now, in view of such a history of impotence and failure and disaster, and casting a side glance at the disgraceful *fiasco* of the South African Committee, and at the miserable and wholly unnecessary war on our Indian frontier (of which more anon), we are, I

¹ *Observer*, October 17, 1897.

fear, constrained to admit that the year 1897, year of the Queen's Jubilee though it be, will be remembered in the history of England as a year of shame and humiliation almost unparalleled in the annals of our country's government! Mr. Chamberlain, indeed, speaks of those who complain of our country's humiliation as the "Uriah Heeps of politics." This is mere catchpenny platform oratory, though good enough, no doubt, for the Brummagem Unionists. For no one knows better than the astute Foreign Secretary that it is one thing to be humble and another to complain of being humiliated. When Van Tromp sailed up the Thames with a broom at his masthead we may well believe that those who most keenly felt England's humiliation were the least humble in the land. If it be humility to accuse the Government to which Mr. Chamberlain belongs of having brought disgrace upon the British flag and of being incompetent to direct the destinies of the Empire, it is a kind of humility which we Liberals may certainly be content to cultivate.

Finally, one word as to the future. What henceforth is to be England's policy with regard to the Turkish Empire? It is clear as daylight what it ought to be, and what it will be if the nation as a whole ever come to realise the situation. When will England be made to understand that for the last half-century, while we have been shouting "Britons never, never will be slaves," and posing as the champions of freedom throughout the world, England has, by her fatuous policy, been upholding the most odious system of tyranny that the world has ever seen, and thus keeping in slavery and under the oppressor's heel millions of miserable beings who would otherwise have won to the light of liberty and gained for themselves the unspeakable blessings of independence?

This is no question of Mohammedan and Christian merely. Spain was once under the Moslem Moors, and for nearly eight centuries under those Mohammedan rulers Spain set to all Europe a shining example of a civilised and onlightened State. Art, literature, and science prospered in Spain as they prospered nowhere else in Europe. Libraries and hospitals were established. Mathematics, astronomy, and botany, history, philosophy, and jurisprudence were to be mastered in Spain more fully than in any other land; and as a great authority has written, "Whatsoever makes a kingdom great and prosperous, whatsoever tends to refinement and civilisation, was found in Moslem Spain."¹

But far otherwise is it with the Moslem Turk. The Ottoman Turks are a Tartar race; and in their dealings with the Christian races with whom they have been brought into contact they have always displayed the savage ferocity which they have inherited from their barbarian ancestors. The Turk has shown himself incapable of reform, incapable of assimilating the ideas and civilisation of the

¹ Stanley Lane-Poole, Preface to *The Moors in Spain*. Story of the Nations Series.

West. He has proved himself utterly unfit to govern Christian races. His empire in Europe is the Abomination of Desolation standing where it ought not. The policy of England towards the ruler of such an empire is surely plain. Instead of allying ourselves (perish the thought!) with this representative of evil upon earth, we must do everything in our power to hasten the day when the withering blight of his rule shall be known to Europe no more. "Bag and baggage from Europe"—such should be England's policy for the Turk.

And here let me for a moment pause to notice an argument which, absurd and contemptible though it be, is not unfrequently put forward by our Philo-Turkish fanatics. It is said that the Sultan is the *Khalif*—the supreme head of the Mohammedan world, and that if England adopts a policy hostile to the Khalif, we shall give offence to the Mohammedan subjects of the Queen in India, and thereby endanger the stability of our Indian Empire. It might be sufficient to reply in the words used by Mr. Forster in 1876 :

"There is no man who more feels than I do the duty of maintaining that great empire. . . . But I will never consent to hold that power upon the condition that England's verdict upon right or wrong shall depend, not upon the consciences of its own people, or upon the actual right or wrong of the matter, but upon the opinion and action of our fellow-countrymen in India. One hears that argument sometimes made use of by those who talk of a spirited foreign policy, and who are advocating our Imperial rule. There would be an end of our Imperial rule if we consented to such humiliation as that. It is one of those dangers which no country can afford to take into account; it is a fear which we must not regard. We cannot consent to govern India upon the ground that our policy is to be dictated, not by the justice of the matter, but by the prejudices or fears of any of our Indian subjects. . . . English prestige would be gone in India; and after all it is not the Musulman only we have to deal with. An enormous majority are Hindus, and what would they think of that country which governed its relations to Christian Europe upon a regard to Musulman prejudices?"

But in truth, those who advance this argument are either very ignorant or very dishonest. The truth is that the Sultan is *not* Khalif or "Commander of the Faithful." He has no right to bear, nor does he bear, that title. Mohammedans throughout the world are divided into two great sects or parties, the Shiah and the Sunni, who regard each other as heretics :

"The former occupy Persia; there are some 5,000,000 of them in India, and some millions more are scattered over the rest of the Mohammedan world. To the Sunni division belong Turkey, Afghanistan, Morocco, Algeria and Tunis, the Soudan, and most of Central Asia and Central Africa. By the sacred law of the Shiah the Khalif must be a lineal descendant of the Prophet. By the sacred law of the Sunni Musulmans the Khalif must belong to Mohammed's tribe, the Koreish."¹

Now it is certain that Abdul Hamid (who is said to be the son of an Armenian female slave) does not fulfil either of these conditions.

¹ *The Sultan and the Powers.* By Canon McColl. P. 146 et seq.

The Ottoman Sultans are excluded from the Khalifat, for they are not Arabs at all, still less of the Koreish tribe. In fact "the Musulman world has been without a Khalif for nearly four hundred years."

This "Indian Musulmans argument" is therefore as false as it is contemptible, and we may dismiss it from our minds. If further proof of its absurdity were required, we might appeal to history. In 1854 we supported the Sultan against Russia by force of arms. Did this stimulate the loyalty of our Indian Musulman subjects? On the contrary, the Crimean War was followed by the Indian Mutiny. The ringleaders of the Mutiny "saw that it took us two years, in union with France, Sardinia, and Turkey, to beat Russia, and they thought their chance had come for driving us out of India and recovering the domination of Islam."

Again, Russia in her war against Turkey in 1877 did not hesitate to employ Musulman troops under Musulman officers against the Sultan, nor has it ever been suggested that they were disinclined to do battle against the supposed Khalif, or that the loyalty of Russia's Musulman subjects was in the least degree shaken or impaired.

No; if we wish to preserve the stability of our Indian Empire we must govern with justice and with strength. A weak policy is of all policies the most perilous. This is well illustrated by the troubles on our North-west frontier. The calamitous, iniquitous, and unnecessary war, which has cost us so many precious lives, and involved a heavy expenditure which the overburdened Indian taxpayer can certainly not be called upon to bear, is, no doubt, the direct outcome of the insane "forward policy" adopted by Lord George Hamilton, and the result of the Government's unfortunate decision to permanently occupy Chitral after the tribes had been led to believe, by the Viceroy's proclamation, that we should withdraw our troops when the object of the expedition had been accomplished. But there were other causes of disaffection at work among the wild frontier tribes. Stories had been carefully disseminated amongst them by the Sultan's emissaries to the effect that the Sublime Porte had not only been victorious over "the great Greek Empire," but had defeated England as well. This latter statement was, indeed, only too true in one sense. The Sultan has been victorious all along the line. But the brave mountaineers were led to believe that this country had actually been beaten in fight by the Mohammedan Turk; that the day of our power was gone; and that the moment was auspicious for proclaiming a holy war. Such is the result of a policy of fear! The danger lies not in opposing the Sultan, but in weakly yielding to him.

The policy of England, therefore, towards the Turk is to "speed the parting guest," to hasten the day when the incubus of his tyranny and the shame of his yoke shall be removed from European territory—yes, and from the regions of Armenia also. And how is

this blessed result to be achieved? Not certainly by the Concert of Europe. The Concert of Europe has never yet done one good thing. "All the good that has been done in Turkey has been done either by the isolated action of one Power, or by the combined action of several—never more than three."¹ It was the isolated action of England, Russia, and France that founded the kingdom of Greece; it was the isolated action of England and France in 1860 which secured peace and a tolerable Government for the Lebanon; it was the isolated action of Russia in 1877 which delivered Bulgaria. It was, again, the isolated action of Russia (not the Concert) which induced Turkey to restrain her victorious troops on the march to Athens, and put an end to the recent war. And so it has ever been. The Concert, the Areopagus of Europe, the Cabinet of the Powers, the Conclave of Christianity—these are pompous phrases which may please Mr. Curzon and his admirers, but those who live on them might as well fill their bellies with the east wind. The policy of England should be to frankly seek an agreement with Russia; for if England could come to terms with Russia there is no doubt that these two Powers could, between them, soon settle the question of the East. Pending such an arrangement, instead of 'prating of "the integrity of the Turkish Empire," let us lend our influence to all policies which may expedite its downfall. The process must, no doubt, be a gradual one. We must, as the Duke of Argyll says, "act without precipitation and with a due regard to the avoiding of bloody catastrophes." But let us not be deterred from taking the right and honourable course by the mere phantasm of a possible war. War is, indeed, a great and terrible evil; but it is not the greatest of all evils. Dishonour and infamy are worse than war. Yet there are some who, apparently, would rather take the devious paths of infamy and dishonour than incur even the shadow of a risk of war. It was not thus that the freedom and greatness of England were won in times past. If we would be great it is certain that we must have the *courage* to be great. It is not by putting our conscience into commission, it is not by playing second fiddle in an inharmonious and futile Concert that we shall uphold the national dignity, or safeguard the interests of our great Empire. These, I take it, are the lessons of the Year of Shame. It is to be hoped that the Liberal party, and especially the leaders of that party, will profit by them. Signs are not wanting that they are beginning to be appreciated by the people of this country.

AN' ORIGINAL MEMBER OF THE EIGHTY CLUB.

JUDICIAL SEX BIAS.

I.

THE year 1869 was marked, as shown in a previous article on Women's Suffrage, by a signal act of *restitution* to the women of England and Wales. The word *restitution* is used advisedly. It is beyond all question that from the earliest known periods women had been possessed at least of the local franchises which entitled them to be members of the body corporate of any corporate borough. The old burgess-rolls of many of our ancient cities and boroughs bear witness to this, notably London and Edinburgh. Indeed in our ancient London certain abbesses are known to have been amongst the official rulers of the city even before the date of the earliest charters. And not only could qualified unmarried women vote, but an ancient custom of the city, dating from a time long prior to the compilation of the *Liber Albus*, permitted a married woman to occupy 'herself as a trader separately from her husband, and when thus occupied as a separate trader gave her all the rights and franchises of that position, so that these women have voted in the local elections of the City from the earliest periods and down to the present time. The latest case decided under this ancient custom is thus reported by the *Times* of September 12, 1891 :

"In the course of the revision of the parish lists, Mr. McNeill, the overseer of the ward of Aldersgate, called attention to the name of Mary Jane Wymer, who claimed to vote for the London County Council in respect of a tenement at 82 Aldersgate Street. The overseer stated that Mrs. Wymer was a married woman, carrying on business in her own name at the address mentioned, where she also resided with her husband, who was the person therefore entitled to vote. He suggested that the name of the husband should be substituted for that of the wife, and transferred to List I., entitling him to both a Parliamentary and a County Council vote. The Revising Barrister said that, by the custom of the City, if a married woman carried on business in her own name, even though her husband resided with her, she was entitled to a vote, as the husband in those circumstances must be supposed to be of no occupation. The name was, therefore, allowed to stand."

So also in the City of Edinburgh, not only unmarried but even qualified married women appear to have been from the earliest times capable of voting on matters of local government. In the year 1869, at the very time of the act of restitution of which I have

spoken, a case was brought before the Edinburgh City Council on May 18. On that day, at the meeting of the Council, the Lord Provost's Committee reported on the claim of a woman who had asked to have her husband admitted a burgess in her right. The question had been remitted by a previous meeting of the Council to the Lord Provost's Committee for inquiry, and they, after going through all the ancient precedents, declared that, though the husband could not be admitted a burgess in right of his wife, the qualifications of the wife were such as entitled her to be admitted a burgess in her own right.

Nevertheless, the Municipal Corporations Act, applying to England and Wales, passed in 1835, had, following the evil precedent of the Reform Act of 1832, by its use of the words "male person," with regard to the franchises conferred by it, for the time extinguished the ancient and immemorial local franchises of women so far as corporations affected by it were concerned. This disfranchisement of women in such towns lasted till the year 1869. At that time a Municipal Franchise Bill was before Parliament, enlarging the powers of the "male persons" alone recognised by the Act of 1835. It should be remembered that for thirty-four years no women had been permitted to vote in any corporate towns under that Act. Nevertheless in districts governed by Local Boards of Health or by Improvement Commissioners, women ratepayers had gone on voting during this period of the disfranchisement of their sisters in municipal boroughs. In the same year, 1869, the town of Southport applied for a charter of incorporation, and the women ratepayers (a considerable number in Southport) found to their dismay that, should the charter of incorporation be granted, they would be summarily disfranchised and compelled to submit to rating and other regulations which they would no longer have any power whatever to control, either directly or through their elected representatives. Some of the most active friends of women brought these two points under the notice of Parliament whilst the Municipal Franchise Bill was before the House of Commons, with the result that, by common consent and without one dissentient voice, the word "male" was struck out of the principal enacting clause (clause 1 of the Bill), which provided that every "person" (no longer "male person"), of full age, who had been an occupier for one year within any such borough, and had also during that time actually resided either within the borough or within seven miles of it, should, if duly enrolled, be a burgess of any such borough, and a member of the body corporate of the mayor, aldermen, and burgesses. As a consequence of this act of restitution many thousands of women in corporate towns voted in the elections of the following November, and have continued to do so to the present time. A further provision of the Act, section 3, secured that any such occupier, if

resident within fifteen miles of the said borough, should be entitled to be elected a councillor or an alderman of that borough. It is clearly manifest from this that women were, from the time of the passing of that Act, capable of being not merely electors but elected persons, councillors or aldermen, within the meaning of the Act. A later Act of 1880, the Town Councils and Local Boards Act, provides that every person should be qualified to be elected and to be a member of a local authority who was at the time of election qualified to elect to any membership of that authority. This Act not merely continued the right of women to be, if duly qualified, nominated and elected municipal councillors and aldermen, but to be members as well as electors of every local authority, the latter point being by some persons supposed to be up to that date not absolutely certain.

It is important to remember that the Act of 1869 was an act of restitution only, since even those persons who claim to have been contributory to its passing continually represent it as *giving* the municipal franchise to women for the first time. Even Sir John Hibbert did this in a speech to his former constituents at Oldham on December 16 last.

The object of the present papers is to show how continuously, either from sex bias or from sheer ignorance or forgetfulness of facts in which women are deeply interested, our judges and other highly placed officials have been paring down the rights and liberties of women in almost every direction. At the present moment one effect of such sex biassed judicial decisions has been brought forcibly under consideration. At the time of the London School Board election in November last, a rumour was widely spread that, should the women Progressive candidates prove successful, their opponents would take advantage of the decision in the case of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst* to appeal to the courts with a view to establish the invalidity of the elections on the ground of the incapacity of sex. At the time of the Salford School Board election in December last, a handbill was put forth on behalf of the Rev. Canon Scott, then a candidate for and now chairman of the Salford School Board, who has since avowed his responsibility for it, which read as follows :

"Electors, see to-day's papers. The law has decided that a woman cannot be a member of a County Council. See what the *Solicitor's Journal* says. Women are as ineligible to sit on School Boards as they undoubtedly are to become County Councillors. Therefore, do not waste your votes."

Now since women have been returned to and have acted as members of School Boards ever since the first election in 1870, and as there are now nearly 200 women members of School Boards, it is important to consider the character and effects of the decision in

the case—the case, that is, which decided that women could not be County Councillors—of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst*. It is the opinion of many eminent lawyers, and on the face of the facts it would manifestly be so, that the cases are on all fours, and that if women are not entitled under the terms of the County Council legislation to be County Councillors, neither are they entitled or qualified to be members of School Boards under the educational legislation initiated in 1870. The case, *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst*, was first heard before Mr. Baron Huddleston and Mr. Justice Stephen, who, in consequence of its importance, took time for decision. The final judgment, given on April 14, 1889, by Mr. Justice Stephen alone, in consequence of the illness of Baron Huddleston, was, however, concurred in by that learned judge. Leave being given to appeal, the case was again heard on May 16, 1889, before the Lord Chief Justice (Lord Coleridge), the Master of the Rolls (Lord Esher), Lord Justice Cotton, Lord Justice Lindley, Lord Justice Fry, and Lord Justice Lopes. Mr. Reid, Q.C., Mr. Rigby, Q.C., and Mr. Costelloe, appeared on behalf of Lady Sandhurst, and argued that the general scheme of the legislation in question was to bring women into all the privileges of burgesses, including the right to be elected as well as the right to vote, and pointed to certain sections in which it was absolutely manifest that the masculine must include the feminine, as generally provided by Lord Brougham's Act, unless the contrary be expressed. The question, however, mainly turned upon the technical effect of section 63 of the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, which reads, "for all purposes connected with, and having reference to, the right to vote at municipal elections. Words in this Act importing the masculine gender include women." This is the only place, with the exception of an obscure phrase in sub-section 4 of section 213, which refers to women not under coverture, which occurs in the Municipal Corporations Act.

It should be remembered that the two earlier enactments already referred to, dealing with the local franchises of women, *never mentioned women specifically at all*. They simply included women by omitting the limiting word "male." Yet the right of women as voters at municipal elections, restored to them by the Act of 1869, has never yet been questioned. The contention, not merely of Mr. Justice Stephen, but of the appeal judges who finally decided the case of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst*, is governed rather by the conviction in their own minds, due to inherited and educational sex bias, that no right or privilege can be conferred upon a woman without the express mention of her sex, which is held as a permanent disqualification for all public functions, than to any regard either for abstract justice or for the legal merits of the case.

Mr. Justice Stephen in his judgment, given on April 14, stated

that, "qualified to elect" is not (citing *Fleetham v. Roxburgh*) equivalent to "entitled to vote"; one argument, he says, which weighed with the Court being that, "from the interpretation there contended for, it would follow that women would be entitled to be elected to the office of Town Councillor, because they have a right to vote, but it is clear they are not so entitled." Why and how this is "clear" is not specified, no doubt because it would have been impossible to give any valid reason for it. One is driven indeed to suppose that Mr. Justice Stephen was of the same opinion with Mr. Justice Willes, who, in the case of *Chorlton v. Lings*, cited with approval by the Master of the Rolls, in the case of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst*, is reported to have said that "he took it that neither by the Common Law nor by the Constitution of England was a woman entitled to exercise any public functions." In the judgment given on the case, *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst*, in the Divisional Court, Mr. Justice Stephen cited Mr. Justice Willes as saying "In the cases of constable and sheriff—which latter is the highest authority produced for the exercise of public functions by a woman—the reason given as to the constable is that she could appoint a deputy; and in the solitary exceptional case of the shrievalty of Westmoreland, Anne, Countess of Pembroke, took by descent an office which could have been and usually is, discharged by deputy." Are we to suppose, therefore, that the case of the hereditary Queen of England is an "exception," and has only been admitted into the law by way of exception? Strange, indeed, is it that learned judges could put forward such a doctrine in face of the fact that they exercise their own authority as judges by virtue of their appointment by a female sovereign.

But the case of the lady sheriffs of Westmoreland does not stand alone as alleged. The earliest recorded hereditary lady sheriffs of Westmoreland appear to have been Isabella de Clifford and Idonea de Leyburn, who held the office jointly; the latest to have been the famous Anne de Clifford, who became hereditary high sheriff of Westmoreland in the year 1643, and appears to have fulfilled the duties of that office for more than twenty years. We have also records of Ela, Countess of Salisbury, high sheriff of Wilts, in the reign of Henry III., and of Nicholaa de la Haye, high sheriff of Lincoln, in the reigns of John and Henry III. Before the accession of Queen Victoria there had only been four Queens Regnant of England since the time of the Norman Conquest—Mary Tudor, Elizabeth Tudor, Mary, wife of William of Orange, and Anne. Presumably these four "exceptions" were sufficient to establish the constitutional right of Queen Victoria; but a far greater number of "exceptions" is held by our highest judges to be inadequate to establish the constitutional right of any English woman to hold any public office. We have evidence in the past of the existence of

women Justices of the Peace, of women Marshals, women custodians of castles; in addition, women hereditary Lord High Chamberlains. Even so late as the end of the last century, we have a woman holding the office of keeper of the gaol and market in the town of Southwold in Suffolk.¹

As to women holding the office of sexton, we have most interesting facts given in the case of *Olive v. Ingram*, heard before the Court of King's Bench in Hilary Term, 12 Geo. II. The case was heard before the then Lord Chief Justice, Sir William Lee, and the Justices, Sir Francis Page, Sir Edmund Probyn, and Sir William Chapple, and, on account of its importance, was brought before the Court four times. On one of the earlier occasions Lord Chief Justice Lee is reported to have cited, from a manuscript collection of Hakewell's, the case *Catherine v. Surrey*, in which it was expressly decided that a *feme sole*, if she has a freehold, may vote for members of Parliament, and a further case from the same collection, *Holt v. Lyle*, in which it was decided that a *feme sole* householder may claim a vote for Parliament men, but if married her husband must vote for her. The Solicitor-General, Sir John Strange, who afterwards became Master of the Rolls, was engaged in this case, the final decision of which he briefly reports (2 Strange, 1114) to have been heard in Trinity Term, 12 George II., and says, "In this case two points were made, first, whether a woman was capable of being chosen sexton, and secondly, whether women could vote in the election. As to the first, the Court seemed to have no difficulty about it, nor did I think proper to argue it, there having been many cases where *offices of greater consequence* have been held by women, and there being many women sextons now in London."

Later in the century, 1788, in the case of *Rec v. Stubbs*, the question was raised on the appointment of overseers of a township called the Township of the Monastery of Rentel Abbey, in Staffordshire. One of the persons appointed was a Mrs. Stubbs,

¹ The following document, connected with fairs, gaols and markets, is not without interest :

"BOROUGH OF SOUTHWOLD, SUFFOLK.

"To Margaret Dean, Keeper of the Common Gaol and Market in, Southwold aforesaid.

"We, John Robinson and William Hailstone, Esqrs., two of his Majesty's Justices of the Peace in and for the said Borough, do hereby strictly charge and command you, the above-named Margaret Dean, that so long as you shall continue in your said office from time to time, and at all times hereafter; that you shall and do ask, collect, and receive all such sum and sums of money as is herein mentioned, being for groundage and for stalls put up in the said Market-place, on Fair and Market Days: and also as Gaol Keeper receive the several fees herein mentioned, of the several persons committed to your care and custody, and for your so doing, this shall be your sufficient warrant.

"Given under our hands and seal of office, the twenty-eighth day of September, in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred and eighty-nine."

A long list of fair, gaol, and market fees to be received, is appended to this document.—Wake's *History of Southwold*, pp. 28-30.

and the appointment was confirmed by the Sessions, but subject to the opinion of the Court of King's Bench. It was argued that if a woman was eligible because she was a substantial householder, so might idiots or lunatics be eligible, as many of them were substantial householders. Mr. Justice Ashhurst, however, confirmed the appointment. He said that the only qualification required of overseers by the Act 43 Elizabeth, cap. 2, was that they should be substantial householders.

"The qualification has no reference to sex. There was nothing in the office to make a woman incompetent. [Counsel had argued that there were things in it which it would be indecent for a woman to undertake.] There were many instances of offices of a higher nature where women were held not to be disqualified, as in the case of the office of High Chamberlain, High Constable, and Marshall, and that of a common constable, which was an office of trust, and likewise in a degree judicial. So in the case of the office of sexton."

It is very obvious that neither Mr. Justice Ashhurst nor the judges in the case of *Olive v. Ingram* held, with our later judges, that sex was of itself a complete bar and a proof of incapacity for any public office.

To return now to the case of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sundhurst*. Since both Mr. Justice Stephen at the original hearing and Lord Esher in the Court of Appeal cited the case of *Chorlton v. Lings* as bearing authoritatively upon the question before them, it is important to explain what that case really was. Before doing so it is necessary to state that the Reform Act of 1832 is the first statute relating to the parliamentary franchise into which was ever imported any question of sex. That Act by the use of the words "male person" restricted to male persons only the 'privilege of the new parliamentary franchises which it gave. When the Representation of the People Act, 1867, was before Parliament Mr. John Stuart Mill, then a member of the House of Commons, put down an amendment to the effect that instead of the word "man," which was used throughout the Bill, the word "person" should be introduced as the term granting the franchises under that measure. This was not carried, and the word "man" was retained. Another amendment, substituting the words "male person" was, however, equally rejected. Consequent upon the rejection of the word "male" some thousands of women claimed to vote under the new Act. Their claims were consolidated in two cases, the one, that of a woman occupier in a town, and the other, that of a woman freeholder in a county. These came before the Court of Common Pleas on November 9, 1868, as the case *Chorlton v. Lings* and the case *Chorlton v. Kessler*. The judges were Lord Chief Justice Bovill, and Justices Byles, Keating and Willes. The Representation of the People Act, it was argued (Section 3), enacts that every "man" shall, in and after the year

1868, be entitled to be registered as a voter, and when registered to vote for a member or members to serve in Parliament for a borough, who is qualified as follows: first, is of full age, and, second, not subject to any legal incapacity. It was further pointed out that by Lord Brougham's Act, Section 4, "In all Acts of Parliament words importing the masculine gender shall be held to include females unless the contrary is expressly provided." It was argued, therefore, on behalf of the women, that the word "man" in the Representation of the People Act did, for the purposes of voting, include women. The final judgment was that women are subject to a legal incapacity from voting at the election of members of Parliament. It was also held that the word "man" in the Representation of the People Act did not, despite Lord Brougham's Act, include women. Lord Chief Justice Bovill in his judgment seems to have argued very loosely as to the use of the word "man" in the Representation of the People Act, as interpreted by Lord Brougham's Act. He affirmed, first, that we must look at the subject matter and the whole scope of an Act to decide whether Lord Brougham's Act applies, and then further, he alleged, that in the very next Act in the Statute Book, the Factory Act, 30-31 Vict. c. 103, the words women and females are used, excluding men. But the fact clearly tells the other way, as the object was to limit this Act to women, whilst the use of the word "man" would have made it applicable to male persons also. Moreover the same judge in the course of these proceedings quoted Selden (*England's Epinomis*, ch. 2), as saying that women not only voted but also assisted in the deliberations of the legislature in early times. The plain truth apparently is that Lord Chief Justice Bovill and Justices Byles, Kenting and Willes shared the sex bias of Sir Edward Coke, who appears to have originated this high-handed dictum of the absolute incapacity of women on the ground of sex for public functions. Coke was cited in the course of the case *Chorlton v. Lings*, but in justice to him the fact, which was pointed out by Lord Coleridge, who was acting as counsel in the case, must be remembered, that the fourth *Institute* in which alone Coke touches the question, was not published till after his death, and had not the benefit of his revision, so that it cannot be regarded as of equal authority, even as to his own opinions, with the others. Yet so far as can be traced this was the first legal dictum on which the alleged disability of sex rests; all later voices, including those of our judges, being merely echoes of it. It is therefore important to cite the actual text. Coke is speaking directly of "spiritual assistants, *procuratores cleri*," and only in the most slight and passing way refers to the case of women. "And in many cases multitudes are bound by acts of parliament which are not parties to the elections of knights, citizens, and burgesses, as all they that have no freehold in

ancient demesne, and all women having freehold or no freehold, and men within the age of one-and-twenty years.”

Coke's animus against any activity on the part of women in public affairs may be further gathered from the *Commons' Journals* for 1620. In that year, sitting as member for Liskeard, he objected even to the examination of women as witnesses by the House of Commons, on the plea that “a woman ought not to speak in the congregation.” On this particular occasion his plea prevailed, and four members were deputed to examine the lady, Mrs. Newdigate, and to report her evidence to the House. Nevertheless, our modern courts of law have not been led by Coke's authority to refuse to hear any public testimony of women, and there is no reason of justice or common sense in favour of our judges accepting the expression of Coke's mere opinion as the ground in these later days for the exclusion of women from the Parliamentary franchise.¹

The case of *Chorlton v. Kessler*, which the Court would not allow to be argued, raised another point, the right of women freeholders in counties. The Reform Act of 1832, whilst it conferred the new franchises on *male* persons only, reserved some of the ancient rights of voters, including that of the forty shilling freeholders, and in referring to these old rights used only the word “person.” This freehold qualification was the basis of the claim of the women in the counties. But both cases were decided by the Court of Common Pleas on the same ground of the absolute, ineffaceable, ineradicable, sex incapacity of women. It is important to note that just as the Reform Act of 1832 gives the first statutory limitation or disqualification in any respect of women as voters, so the case of *Chorlton v. Lings* is the first judicial decision limiting their powers as voters. The only legal statement that existed historically before 1868 was the arbitrary and unsupported dictum of Sir Edward Coke, previously referred to, and that given, not as a judicial decision, but incidentally in the course of his legal work *The Institute*.

The further case of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst* seems also to be the first judicial decision limiting the capacity of women for public functions or offices. It will be seen that the earlier decisions cited have gone in the direction of affirming and almost extending their right in that direction. In the case of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst*, all the considerations not based directly upon the alleged “natural incapacity” of women are summed up by Lord Chief Justice Coleridge in his judgment. He said :

“That if the matter had turned upon the construction of a variety of statutes, or depended upon doctrines of the common law, it might have been

¹ In the year 1640, an election for the county of Suffolk being held, some of the clerks received the votes of certain Puritan women, tendered for Puritan candidates. The High Sheriff, Sir Simon D'Ewes, however, disallowed them. “Conceiving it a matter verie unworthy anie gentleman, and most dishonourable in such an election to make use of their voices, although they might in law have been allowed.”

worthy of further consideration. But, in his opinion, it was a question to be determined upon simple considerations. In 1888 a new office, that of county councillor, was created by statute, and, apart from the statute, there was no inherent or common law right in any person to hold that office. The right to hold that office must be found within the four corners of the statute. Further, down to the year 1888 no woman had, as a matter of fact, ever sat upon a municipal corporation. The laws relating to and the qualifications for being elected to municipal corporations, were made applicable to county councils. They must, therefore, go back to the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, to see what were the qualifications for and the limitations as to candidates for the office of county councillor. It was argued that the Act of 1882 conferred upon women the right to sit upon municipal corporations, and therefore upon county councils. From 1869, when women obtained the municipal franchise, down to 1889, was too short a time to give rise to the doctrine of *contemporanea expositio*; still, it ought not to be left out of sight that the right of voting was expressly given by the Municipal Franchise Act, 1869, and since that time the question of the rights and privileges of women had not been allowed to sleep, but had been keenly discussed. Surely it was a significant fact that never since 1869 had any woman ever sat upon a municipal corporation. It was said, however, that they were qualified to sit. That depended upon the true construction of two or three sections of the Act of 1882. But for one section he should have felt considerable difficulty—section 11 related to the qualification for a councillor, and by subsection 3 every person was qualified to be a councillor who was qualified to elect. That section would be a strong argument for the appellant but for a later section. It was true that the words used were in the masculine gender, *but, except for section 63, it would be reasonable to apply Lord Brougham's Act, and to say that as women were qualified to elect, so also were they qualified to be elected. But in his view section 63 was conclusive on the question.* Mr. Rigby, when asked, gave no answer to this question—What was the use of section 63 if Lord Brougham's Act, coupled with the Act of 1882, gave women the power of electing and of being elected? *No answer was given, because none could be given.* The sections preceding section 63 related to voting, and then came section 63, which said in effect that the provisions were, as regards women, *limited to the right to vote, and did not include the right to be elected.* In sections as to taxation and criminal offences, in order to give the necessary effect to the statute, the masculine gender must include the feminine."

Lord Coleridge in his argument said: "Surely it was a significant fact that never since 1869 had any woman ever sat upon a municipal corporation;" and Mr. Justice Stephen at the earlier hearing said: "As for the contention that the Act of 1869 extends to the removal of the disqualification of women, it is enough to say that no instance since 1869 of a woman holding high municipal office has been produced, and this is a contemporary exposition of the Act to which we think some weight attaches." The period covered is only that of twenty years. How many centuries elapsed without the rule of a woman as Queen Regnant of England? Surely if centuries do not destroy the right in the case of the supreme public function, twenty years cannot be alleged to be a sufficient practical exposition of the law to destroy the right of women in minor offices, and indeed Lord Coleridge seemed to be somewhat of that opinion, since he alleged

that the period from 1869 to 1889 was too short a time to give rise to the doctrine of *contemporanea expositio*. But when he pointed out the "most significant fact," that no woman during those twenty years was ever elected to high municipal office, he must surely have forgotten that there were very special reasons of difficulty in the way. The property qualification stood in the way. Owing to our unjust laws of inheritance, and to unjust social custom, which pays inferior wages to women for equal work with men, women are usually exceedingly poor, the number of rich women being so small as simply to mark more strongly the general poverty; so that whilst a property qualification was essential to eligibility as a municipal councillor, there is no wonder that women did not come forward as candidates, seeing they had neither the qualification nor the means of paying the expenses of a contested election. How largely the property qualification has hindered the public action of women may be readily seen from the fact that up to the year 1893 not more than 200 women were at any time acting as Poor Law Guardians, but as soon as the rating qualification was withdrawn and the question made one simply of residence and of personal fitness attested by the choice and votes of the electors, the number of women Poor Law Guardians rose to nearly 900.¹

Lord Coleridge affirmed that in his view, and in this he followed the interpretation of the earlier law in these matters as given by earlier decisions, had it not been for the presence of section 63 in the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, it would be reasonable to apply Lord Brougham's Act, and to say that as women were qualified to elect, so also were they qualified to be elected, but in his view section 63 was conclusive on the subject.

It should be remembered in this connection that the word used uniformly throughout the Municipal Corporations Act is, as in the earlier Acts referred to, "person" only. No question of male or female is raised till we reach section 63, which provides that "For all purposes connected with and having reference to the right to vote at municipal elections, words in this Act importing the masculine gender include women."

On the other hand Lord Esher affirmed—

¹ Another point ought to be noted in this connection. Women voters constitute but a very small proportion of the total number of voters in either municipal, county council, or parochial matters. As far as can be judged, they at present average over the whole country about one in seven of the whole number of voters. It is manifest, therefore, that any woman candidate for any office must be returned mainly by the votes of men. Now it is a noteworthy fact that in every post which has long been monopolised by men, there has been at first a great reluctance to accept the co-operation of women. In the case of women guardians this was made painfully evident. In the case of women on School Boards, the office being totally new, time had not been given for the selfishness of sex bias in this direction to take effect; but it is practically certain that, had women even been in a position to offer themselves as candidates for a municipal council under the circumstances existing from 1869 to 1889, the male sex bias would have secured their defeat.

"That section 9, which gave certain persons the right of voting, referred to men. Those who had the right of voting were, by section 11, to have the right to be elected. That section, like section 9, was confined to men. Therefore, in his opinion, upon those two sections men alone could be electors and elected. But prior to 1882 there was a statute in 1869 which conferred the right of voting at municipal elections upon women. *Therefore, if section 63 had been omitted, the law would have been altered, which was not intended. The Legislature, therefore, had to guard against that*, and to say that, notwithstanding sections 9 and 11, they intended to give women the same rights as they had before. That enactment was found in section 63. Section 63 did not give the right, but showed what was the intention of the Legislature as regards sections 9 and 11—namely, that the Legislature intended to give women *a limited right* under these sections. If sections 9 and 11 conferred the right contended for, section 63 was futile."

It will be seen that the arguments of the Lord Chief Justice and Lord Esher are mutually destructive, and that Lord Coleridge's view of *contemporanea expositio* contradicts that of Mr. Justice Stephen. Lord Coleridge elsewhere said: "What was the use of section 63 if Lord Brougham's Act, coupled with the Act of 1882, gave women the power of electing and of being elected? No answer was given because none could be given."

Lord Coleridge's argument assumes a more serious and careful consideration of Acts of Parliament by Parliament itself and even by the draftsmen of the Acts than it is possible for those who know most about the matter to entertain. The Act in question, though a Government measure, and though technically a long time before Parliament, was actually but little considered by either House. Its final stages in the House of Commons, "as amended to be considered," and third reading were both taken on August 2, 1882. It is scarcely possible to suppose that the original draftsman actually intended to take away from women rights previously possessed by them, and section 63 can only be presumed to have been introduced by the over-carefulness, which, through the decision of the judges, defeated its own purpose, of some draftsman who did not fully understand the scope or effect of the Act of 1869.

Nevertheless, the decision in the case of *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst* seems to have reacted mischievously upon the position of women under the Municipal Corporations Act, 1882, seeing that, at any rate in some boroughs, they appear to be no longer enrolled as burgesses, but simply reckoned as "voters," a fact to which certain further consequences, to be spoken of later, attach.

Lord Coleridge alleged that "Section 63 said in effect that the provisions were, as regards women, limited to the right to vote, and did not include the right to be elected. In sections as to criminal offences and taxation, in order to give the necessary effect to the statute, the masculine gender must include the feminine." In spite of the contradictory arguments of Lord Coleridge and the other

judges concerned in this case, they all concurred with Lord Chief Justice Bovill and Justices Byles, Keating and Willes, in practically committing themselves to two very extraordinary doctrines: first, that taxation and representation do not and need not go together; and secondly, that as suggested by the last quotation from Lord Coleridge, one and the same word in Parliamentary enactments, and indeed in the self-same Act of Parliament, means male and female when duties and penalties are imposed, but male only when rights and privileges are conferred, and this in defiance of history, precedent, earlier judicial decisions in kindred questions, and the ordinary construction of other Acts of Parliament. Can further evidence of mere and simple sex bias be needed?

Unfortunately the supporters of the claim of women to be elected and to act as County Councillors did not carry the question to the House of Lords. Otherwise we might possibly have seen, as in the recent Trades Union case of *Allen v. Flood*, the reversal of these judgments and the establishment of just principle. The glorious uncertainty of the law, and of the opinions of the particular judges before whom a case may happen to be tried, is painfully notorious, and leads to continuous injustice, since only very rich persons or bodies have the means of carrying any question from court to court till it is finally decided. Meanwhile, however, the judgment in these two cases constitutes practically binding law at the present moment, and we have here an instance of purely judge-made law gravely affecting the interests of women.

The threatened action in the case of the women members of School Boards is one case in point. Throughout the whole of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, no question of sex is raised. No qualification for membership of a School Board is specified. In the current manuals on the subject, it is simply stated that no qualification, save that of full age and residence, is necessary, and that women are eligible, but this is a deduction, not from any words used in the Act, but from the practice of the first elections, which has been continued to the present time. Women, especially in our large towns, were at once elected upon the first School Boards, and have continued to be elected till now. In that capacity they have rendered great and manifold service to the community, and never was it more necessary than now that that service should be continued. The overwhelming proportion of our teachers are women, girls and infants constitute also an overwhelming majority of the children under education, and it cannot therefore be supposed for a moment that it is either just, fitting, or expedient, that the services of women on School Boards should be dispensed with. Yet, on the principles involved in the decisions in the cases *Chorlton v. Lings* and *Beresford Hope v. Lady Sandhurst*, and on the reasonings of all the judges except Lord Coleridge, it is manifest that no woman could be eligible

for membership of a School Board. Not only so, but as under section 29 of the Elementary Education Act, 1870, the School Board is to be elected in a borough by the persons whose names are on the burgess-roll of such borough for the time being in force, it would follow that women in those towns where they have ceased to be burgesses could not even be electors for School Boards. Further, as in the legislation which first created Boards of Guardians the question of sex was not raised, and as no woman was elected a Poor Law Guardian till so recently as the year 1875, it would follow that, till the legislative establishment of their right to be elected and to act as Poor Law Guardians by the Local Government Act of 1894, all previous elections of women in that capacity were of no legal validity, and might have been set aside had any one chosen to raise the question in a court of law. Mr. Justice Stephen's doctrine of *contemporanea expositio* would here have applied with certainly greater appositeness than in the case to which he sought to apply it. Yet, though there are still benighted parts of England not availing themselves of the services of women as Poor Law Guardians, who will venture to say that these services can be wisely dispensed with? The legislation of 1894 has, happily, set the question at rest so far as women Poor Law Guardians are concerned. But, in the case of School Boards, the only argument which could weigh with the courts would be that prescription and usage had created a customary right not originally conveyed by legislation. Whether our courts would recognise any such right is altogether uncertain, and the lesson to be drawn from the insecurity of all rights and privileges of women which depend either upon legislation or upon the legal interpretation of the law is the strongest argument possible for giving to them that equitable share of control over legislation, and thereby over the makers of the law and over its interpreters, which the possession of the Parliamentary franchise can alone secure.

IGNOTA.

MATTHEW ARNOLD AS A POLITICAL AND SOCIAL CRITIC.

IT may at first sight seem rather late in the day to examine the questions involved in Mr. Arnold's book *Culture and Anarchy*, first published about twenty-five years ago. But the problems with which it dealt are most of them still with us, still have in some way or other to be solved. Some of the conditions may perhaps have altered, but the main facts remain the same. Our point of view may possibly have changed; but it must be interesting, and it may be profitable, to see how these things appeared then to a man who was recognised as representative of the highest culture of his day. And then the book itself is such a gem of literary art that those who have read it will be glad to have its charms recalled, and those who have not until now done so will feel grateful at having had their attention called to it.

It is pleasant to be able to "prophesy good things" about an author whose work has claimed many hours of reading and thought.

The book which is the *raison d'être* of this paper is a lasting memorial to the skill and talent of its writer, and will probably live longer as a standard of literary form and technique than as an exposition of political and social questions. Problems of vast importance are treated of in so ethereal a manner, with a diction so easy and elegant, a style so flowing and melodious, and with such an absence of apparent care or effort, that in the end the reader rubs his eyes and is constrained to ask himself whether these serious matters which have been reviewed are after all real, whether they are not mere myths and dreams raised by a powerful magician and dissipated once again by a wave of his wand. With all seeming boldness Mr. Arnold approaches the difficulties that beset his argument, raises round them a cloud of graceful expressions, throws in a few phrases concerning the desirability of a "free play of thought on our stock notions," and an allusion to "marrying one's deceased wife's sister," and once more glides away on his even course like a skilful skater on dangerous ice, quite indifferent to the dark yawning abysses which he has but narrowly avoided.

It would be difficult to select a subject for study more attractive

in its nature than culture, or to find a writer more pleasing in style than he who has been not unjustly called the apostle of the Hellenic dispensation. But still it must be admitted that the many-sidedness of the study of individual and general perfection would be more likely to be furthered by the precision and lucidity of Mr. John Stuart Mill, than by the vague generalisation, inaccurate detail, and eloquent declamation, which seem to be inseparable from Mr. Matthew Arnold.

The ostensible object of the essay is "to commend culture as the great help out of our present difficulties," social, political, and religious, in fact, as an antidote to anarchy; its real effect, though no doubt without malice aforethought on the part of its writer, to teach a doctrine of refined indifference, of dignified *laissez-faire* so far as matters of mere everyday life are concerned, while those who have time, means, and opportunity employ themselves in becoming perfect—a theory very desirable were all mankind thus blessed, but which unfortunately takes little note of nine-tenths of the human race, and is about as practical as the suggestion of a princess of whom we have heard ere this, that bread being scarce a starving crowd should be fed on buns.

Mr. Arnold discusses the practical portions of his subject with the air of a divinely-sent teacher, to whom the momentous difficulties of active life are mere child's-play, social problems but bubbles to be pricked, vice and crime simply unpleasant accidents to be got rid of by a liberal use of rosewater, but unfortunately with much of the inutility with which a kid-gloved and bescented dandy might put his shoulder to the wheel of a brewer's dray. Our prophet has, moreover, the misfortune to be haunted; his *bête-noire* is "Nonconformity, the Dissidence of Dissent and the Protestantism of the Protestant Religion," the very mention of which is sufficient to throw him into a frenzy well-nigh approaching hysterics, and this fearful spirit is helped in its terrors by the bogies of "Disestablishment" and "The Real Estate Intestacy Bill," while the most cursory remark in favour of marriage with a deceased wife's sister causes him to shut his eyes and madly beat the air.

Despite all this, however, we admit fairly and freely that Mr. Arnold is a teacher, if not of truth, at least of half truths, and those of a very valuable kind. Indeed, could we but once convince ourselves, or become convinced, that the other half were already adequately taught and acted on, and that there is much danger of their being really too much taught, as Mr. Arnold maintains, we should be happy to adopt his theory, if not his applications of it. His real fault is that in his laudable anxiety to propagate "Hellenism," "spontaneity of consciousness," "the desirability of a free play of thought on our stock notions," and so forth, he lamentably under-rates the value of the other great means towards the attain-

ment of perfection which he calls "Hebraism," and which consists mainly in the development of the moral side of man's nature and the striving to reduce at once to practice whatever of light a man may have.

O lover, striver after and teacher of culture, why hast thou closed thine eyes that thou shouldst not see, and stopped thine ears that thou shouldst not hear? Hast thou looked with more than a mere purblind glance on the men around thee, and yet thinkest that too much time and effort have been given to moral teaching? Hast thou seen the multitudes of thy fellow creatures, crushed under the load of undeserved poverty, which seems to them as inevitable as though it were a law of Nature? Hast thou heard them, sunk in vice, to which the Nemesis of a false civilisation has driven them, crying out from the midst of their degradation for they know not what save "a deliverance," and yet canst elegantly offer them "intellectual development" and "the free play of thought on their stock notions"?

Behold! this is the panacea for all their woes. 'This is the patent medicine to cure all diseases! As well might one put before a hungry man a meal of stones and wind and tell him to eat and drink and therewithal be filled. Thy teaching may be good—nay, without doubt *is* good for those who are already dragged out of the mire; but for these?

Away! away! with such dilettantism, and let Hebraism, with its belief in the law of God, take these by the hand and lead them, or if need be, even with its terrors, drive them, to a higher moral level. Then, indeed, may there be some hope from Hellenism. No culture that was ever yet taught on this earth, of the intellectual sort, has stirred or could stir this helpless mass, could force or instil into a man's mind the infinite importance of every man to himself, and consequently of each to each, and the prime necessity of honourable existence, that a man should be honest with himself. The glorious example afforded in the Christian religion may indeed touch the heart of a man, sunk however deeply, when appeals based on the general culture of the Greeks, and the desirability of "harmonious perfection developing all sides of our humanity," would be as ineffectual to arouse him as the whispering of a passing breeze.

Let it should be thought that thus far we have misrepresented Mr. Arnold's teaching, we will endeavour to give chapter and verse from his brilliant essay, and we hope to be forgiven should it be found necessary, in following an argument supported by much generalisation and little detail, to make somewhat wide excursions into topics bearing upon the matter in hand.

Says our essayist, "Culture is pursuit of our total perfection by means of getting to know, on all matters which most concern us, the best which has been thought and said in the world, and through this

knowledge turning a stream of fresh and free thought upon our stock notions and habits ;" this also he calls "the love of light and of seeing things as they are"; and because this was so eminently a trait of Greek character as shown in Greek literature and art he christens his creed "Hellenism." Desirable above rubies is this treasure! Happy above many the man who strives for it; thrice happy the nation of which it can be truly said it conscientiously seeks after it! But woe to that man or that nation that puts trust in the object of pursuit. Increase of knowledge brings an additional burden of responsibility, while unfortunately a love of knowledge may exist without an equal desire to act according to it. May we not well ask to what extent the Greeks were the better for their "love of seeing things as they are," and wherein they are worthy to be held up as examples to those who would be devotees at the shrine of "sweetness and light." In poetry, in philosophy, in art it may be unapproachable; but what can be said of their religious rites and mysteries, and their social morality?

We join issue at once with this theory that the "getting to know" this, that and the other good thing is the main necessity for man; the getting the will to do the good thing when known is vastly more important; and the difficulties, social, political and religious, from which Mr. Arnold would rescue us could never have become such stumbling-blocks and obstacles had the true spirit of Hebraism, which he disparages, been acted on. The solution of all the social problems and difficulties under the sun is contained in one short sentence of what Mr. Arnold calls "renovated Hebraism." "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself," and when it shall have been proved that the cultivation of the intellect by means of Hellenism tends more to the fulfilment of this law than the cultivation of the heart by Hebraism, then, and then only, will Mr. Arnold's position have been established.

"The operation of culture is essentially inward," says our author, and so far as it tends to clear the sight, remove prejudices, and enable a man to see things as they are it must be admitted to be an undoubted good. That a man should be refined in his tastes, polished in his manners, without prejudice in his judgments of men and things—these should all flow as natural streams from this great source of culture; but, according to Mr. Arnold's own admission, the cultivation of an individual here and there, though desirable, is not the object which should be held in view, but the pursuit of an aggregate perfection. Now, as it is self-evident that the vast masses of mankind, even in so-called civilised countries, can have little or no opportunity of profiting by his formula, it remains to be demonstrated that the best way of improving them is by cultivating a few select and highly favoured persons.

That such a course can be effective is scarcely possible, for our

author urges that these favoured individuals should show their interest in the welfare of their fellow-men by refraining altogether from taking part in practical affairs, except so far as their position compels them, a notion which has already been put on its trial in America, with lamentable result. There, indeed, the best educated and most cultivated classes long withheld their aid from the working of municipal and political institutions, and there those institutions became, and until recently seemed likely to continue, the scandal and disgrace of the nation.

Herein lies one of the great faults of this theory as to the active beneficence of culture, for the selfishness of man is so great that Hellenism, which should conquer, serves only in most cases to intensify it, and those who attain to even a slight degree of culture are tempted to leave their less fortunate fellow-men to get on as best they may, while they enjoy the selfish ease of their more favoured condition.

If we are to believe Mr. Arnold, England was, at the time of the writing of this book, in a most deplorable state; and as any alterations which have since taken place are simply differences of degree and not of kind, we may take his charges as being in the main as applicable now as then. Not only, then, do the English people bow down and worship the great fetish, "Machinery," forgetting the ends to which the said machinery should be only a means, but as a nation they are characterised by "a want of sensitiveness of intellectual conscience," "a disbelief in right reason," and "a dislike of authority." What may be the exact meaning the writer attaches to these phrases we have not been able fully to discover, though we have carefully pondered the various passages in which he supports his charges, and other passages which seem to have an indirect bearing on them.

As we are prepared to admit that the English nation resembles all others in not being as much under the influence of culture as it should be, and also that our most cultivated men, like all other cultivated men, would probably be the better for more culture still, and as "sensitiveness of intellectual conscience" is one of the many goods which flow from culture, we must admit that in this respect there is very considerable shortcoming. At the same time, we cannot help having a shrewd suspicion that the real grievance, covered by this elegant phrase, is the tendency of the English to be guided by a moral rather than an intellectual conscience, and consequently to incur the displeasure of such critics as the late M. Taine by sacrificing much that is apparently artistic in order to avoid much that is undoubtedly indecent.

The other charges, however, have not even this modicum of foundation. If "disbelief in right reason" meant disbelief in logic absolutely applied to all and several of our customs, laws, and insti-

tutions, we should freely admit, nay, even glory in the charge, and what other meaning it can have as applied to the English nation we are at a loss to know. The nation that should attempt to frame its constitution upon logic, that should, in fact, worship the great idol of France, the logic mill, that should strive without regard to sentiment, and without modifications suitable to varying circumstances, to push to their extreme results all laws arising from a theoretically perfect system of government, would be in danger of having to pay a penalty such as that of which France is still valiantly struggling to get rid. It is the very belief in right reason as opposed to theoretic perfection that has made all Englishmen in most respects equal before the law, that has enabled England to make reforms while France has made revolutions, that has secured for England religious liberty, while Germany, until the last year or two, has been subject to a degrading slavery, and France to a disguised persecution; and that we trust will enable her to weather the storms likely to arise from the progress of democracy and socialism, and from the solution of the problem of labour *versus* capital.

It may be that England is too much wedded to machinery (by which we understand Mr. Arnold to mean Parliaments and all other distinctive representative institutions); but it is undoubtedly the fact that this machinery has hitherto done what it was intended to do, has given to us a stability and order which, sneers notwithstanding, is the envy of other nations, while securing to the individual a liberty of thought and action unknown elsewhere; and that from the very simple fact that it has gradually been built up by a nation loving "right reason" and still willing to alter its machinery whenever it may be found necessary so to do. It is noticeable that since this charge of devotion to machinery for its own sake was formulated, the efforts of our Legislature have resulted in a gigantic system of School Board education, in the establishment of county, district and parish councils, and of sundry land commissioners and commissions, not for the sake of the machinery, but with certain clearly defined objects, and that at the present time there is a marked impatience on the part of the average man at the inefficiency of certain portions of the machinery of legislation, and a reasonable prospect of the alteration and improvement of that machinery.

The third charge brought against this much enduring nation is that it has "a dislike of authority," which, again, would be true enough if by "authority" is meant "despotism," or authority without the sanction of any law save the will of one or more persons exercising an usurped power. Against all such "authority" it behoves every rational man to protest; for until an infallible man or an infallible class is found, a benevolent despotism must be regarded with suspicion and dislike as having no basis whatever in "right reason." Wherein is the "dislike of authority" displayed?

First, and apparently this is the sin of sins and the forefront of our offending, we have no Academy like that of France, whose decision upon matters of taste in literature and whose judgments in art may be taken as final.

When we consider the treatment to which many of the most eminent French writers, notably Victor Hugo and M. Renan, have been exposed by this much lauded institution, when we remember how large a proportion of its favoured members have fallen into deserved oblivion, and how little respect it has inspired among the French people, we cannot profess to regret that here we have no literary trade union, bestowing privileges upon its devoted slaves, and prostituting its powers to the service of a religious sect or a political faction.

In matters of religion again the English nation has sinned deeply in that it has not seen its way clear to submitting to "authority," in which word is summed up what Mr. Arnold would have us believe is the glory of the whole earth, "the English Episcopal Church as by law established." Why we should stop here we cannot tell. At least this Church has never claimed for itself infallibility, and has as many varieties of belief and disbelief within its communion as all other sects put together. If "harmonious perfection" is the object to be attained, why should authority be vested in an institution so thoroughly divided against itself that for at least two generations it has only been held together by a legal tie and a due respect for the things of this world? The love of "right reason" is prevailing against it as an Establishment, and there remain but few, even among doctrinaires, who profess to see any reasonable standpoint between wholesale concurrent endowment and total disestablishment. As no other sects will consent to barter away their freedom for endowment or privilege, we shall have in the natural order of events to submit to the other course, and some of us may live to see the time when the Church will be freed from its political shackles and the vast body of its lay members have some effective voice in its affairs.

Politically also we were, and if so still are, in a very bad way. We have rebelled against the authority of a monarchy, which gave place to that of an aristocracy, this again falling before an uprising of the middle classes, and now at the time Mr. Arnold's book was written the working classes all raising an uproar asking for their "rights." Since then the "rights" have been granted, the base of the political structure widened, and England still stands as she did, and still has the honour to be the most easily governed nation in the world.

Do we not stand condemned as a nation abhorring authority? Yet when we look more closely at the matter we find that injustice has been the great provocative and a love of "right reason" the great incentive to these outrageous and wicked proceedings. So long

as kings deserved they obtained willingly from their subjects, loyalty ; so long as an aristocracy ably and justly conducted the affairs of the country they obtained due respect and obedience ; so long as king, lords and middle classes were sufficient for their duties, the rest of the nation willingly left matters in their hands. But "right reason" has urged continually that increase of privilege and responsibility should go hand in hand with increase of power, and thus as each class has become more and more fitted for taking part in the joint government of the country, it has had bestowed upon it more and more of authority in the making and executing of its laws. And for this reason above all others has England obtained the reputation of being the most orderly and law-abiding of nations. An Englishman's love of liberty is proverbial, but so also is his deference towards and respect for law, which for the time being is the best representation we have of the collective "best self" of the whole people, susceptible indeed of vast improvement and fortunately being continually altered and improved to suit the development of the nation and the continual increase of knowledge as to its social conditions and requirements.

Our system is indeed far from perfect, we have possibly among us as large a proportion of disorderly intentioned persons as any other nation, yet it is a curious comment upon the dislike of the nation for authority that a police force of some 12,000 men should be found sufficient to protect life and property and to preserve even an appearance of order in a city numbering upwards of 5,000,000 of people.

The Cassandra-like lamentations of elegant dilettanti and highly cultured theorists have attended all practical reforms in the past, and will, we suppose, attend them so long as reforms are made ; but until the prophets of ill and the believers in things as they were can agree among themselves as to which is the Golden Age of the past to which we should strive to get back, their prophecies and lamentations are likely to continue mere causes for laughter to practical men.

At present we have dwelt almost exclusively upon Mr. Arnold's theories, we will now endeavour to follow him briefly into the consideration of one or two practical questions which he has treated at some length and so far as we can judge with no little injustice.

The first of these is that of Disestablishment, which, at the time of the publication of this book, had just been commented on in a very practical manner by the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and which cannot fail to have special interest now, seeing that a Bill for the disestablishment of the English Church in Wales was recently before Parliament.

We have laid before us the grand notion that "The State is of the religion of all its citizens without the fanaticism of any," as

though that at once settled the whole question and proved without possibility of doubt that the duty of the State is to maintain the present Church establishment. Of course the formula has no bearing whatever on the question in hand unless that which is not a fact be assumed to be a fact—namely, that the Church as by law established is of the religion of all the citizens of the State without the fanaticism of any. If it were so the question under discussion could never have arisen. There may have been a time when Church and people were co-equal and co-extensive. At present it is a debatable point whether the Nonconformist and Roman Catholic population of Great Britain and Ireland is not quite as large as the population claimed on the very loosest and broadest grounds by the Established Church. And who can contend that the present Established Church is free from fanaticism when one of its most honoured bishops denounced as works of the devil, beer-houses *and chapels*, when Nonconformists who are opposed to Establishment are daily denounced by bishops and Members of Parliament as sacrilegious robbers, when many of the Church's most open-hearted and wide-minded representatives are vilified and persecuted for holding social and religious intercourse with members of other communions, and when two of its great sections have successively prosecuted one another by law, bringing the whole system into contempt by the readiness with which they nominally conform with legal decisions in a way which among laymen would be deemed dishonourable.

Mr. Arnold, however, was so little influenced by his own Hellenic doctrines that he was never without self-evident prejudice in dealing with Puritanism in any shape, and so in this instance brushes on one side any argument adduced against an Establishment as of no importance, and rings the changes with much satisfaction to himself on the meanness and fanaticism of Dissent and its unreasonable antipathy to State churches.

The strongest argument against an Establishment, and that which most influences all those to whom religion itself is of more importance than the human system by which it is maintained and promulgated, is the fact that connection with the State and dependence on it reduces the office of the priesthood to a profession. It makes the priest a State official, whose appointment and progress depend not upon any love for the work he undertakes, or any special fitness for it, but upon his acquiring a certain minimum of knowledge and receiving assistance and patronage from persons of influence in that branch of the public service, while the repeated and conflicting decisions of civil courts upon questions of doctrine tend to unsettle the minds of men and afford fresh scope for the scorn and sneers of unbelievers.

The evils of the system are perhaps best illustrated by the appointment of its highest officials, the bishops, nominated it may be by an

infidel, a Jew, or an atheist, elected under the *congé d'élire*, and finally appointed by the head of the Church, who has always been regarded by the most orthodox as being to all intents and purposes a Presbyterian.

Mr. Arnold, however, does not conceal that his sympathies are with those who, misunderstanding the whole question, think that the antagonism of Nonconformists may be bought off by a wholesale system of concurrent endowment. We cannot help thinking that he does an injustice to culture by endeavouring to bring it to bear upon this question. Whether certain moneys shall be distributed amongst various religious sects, according to his theory at deadly enmity one with the other, and the most powerful of which has always been opposed to the cause of freedom of thought, without which culture is impossible, thus causing heart burnings and jealousy to prevail and perpetuating a sentimental grievance; or whether, on the other hand, reasonable indemnity should be given to vested interests, and the balance applied to works in which all good men of whatever persuasion are agreed, is a question which "right reason" would answer with little difficulty, and that certainly not in the sense in which Mr. Arnold has answered on behalf of culture. In this matter the prejudice of the advocate has injured his own cause.

It may be and no doubt is desirable that all men should worship together, but it requires the perception of a Matthew Arnold to see how such an object would be furthered by the distribution of large sums of money to assist them in worshipping differently.

The second practical illustration given is directed against the Real Estate Intestacy Bill, which was intended "to prevent the land of a man who dies intestate from going, as it goes now, to his eldest son;" a piece of machinery, according to our author, utterly opposed to culture. The only true way of rectifying any evils arising from the laws of entail, in his judgment, was to bring culture to bear by pointing out to the barbarians, Mr. Arnold's synonym for aristocracy, the great dangers to which their eldest sons will be exposed by the possession of so much wealth, and by plying them gradually with other like considerations. He was utterly oblivious of the fact that the Bill proposed to deal only with the property of those who were already beyond the reach of any such arguments, and that at the very worst it was but a rough and ready way of securing those ends, which he admits are suggested by culture, in particular instances, where culture itself was of necessity useless.

Says he, in pursuing his argument, "*Does not culture point out that *pouvoir sans savoir est fort dangereux*," and is not the truth of this proverb illustrated continually by the careers of our younger barbarians? Truly it does so, and the proverb is painfully verified. In course of time, perhaps, the barbarians may admit these truths, and act in accordance with the promptings of culture; but does not*

"right reason" point out that it is not wise to continue an evil in cases where it can be checked without interfering in any way with the vested interests or the so-called rights of a class? Does it not imperatively demand that, in cases of intestacy, law should step in and assume that the deceased was a wise and cultured man, and that had he lived longer he would not have wished to expose one son to the dangers of inordinate wealth and the rest of his family to the ills and attendant degradations of an unaccustomed poverty? Does it not, moreover, claim on behalf of society a right to guard itself against the dangers which may arise from the neglect of its individual members? Despite Mr. Arnold's protests, it is evident that culture and the Real Estate Intestacy Bill go hand in hand.

In dealing with his third illustration, Mr. Arnold, we regret to say, finds himself compelled to fall back upon sophistry instead of argument, and misrepresentation in place of facts.

Thus—because Mr. Chambers, in introducing a Bill to legalise marriage with a deceased wife's sister, strove to disarm the prejudices and superstitions of his opponents by showing that such marriages are not condemned, and even are permitted, by the Law of Leviticus—Mr. Arnold deals with the argument as though Mr. Chambers had endeavoured to prove that, because they are not prohibited by the Bible, therefore they must be desirable, and not on any account to be made illegal. Again, Mr. Hepworth Dixon having written a book entitled *Spiritual Wives*, which treated largely of love and marriage in some of their strangest and most objectionable forms, Mr. Arnold seizes on the accident of its publication, and treats of Mr. Chambers' proposition as though it had been based on Mr. Dixon's book, thus, in his endeavour to bolster up a weak case, connecting two entirely independent subjects. To such shifts may an able writer be driven when the culture which he professes to teach has been insufficient to overcome the prejudices derived from early education and confirmed by the conventionalities of the society in which it was his lot to move.

The real line of argument used by Mr. Chambers and his supporters was that, there being no Scriptural law against "marriage with a deceased wife's sister," it is no part of the duty of an Established Church to promulgate such a law, ostensibly on Scriptural grounds, and thus endeavour to make an artificial sin. That this being the case, the matter becomes entirely of a social nature, to be prohibited by law only on the ground of injury to the State. Lastly, that it is not injurious to the State, and therefore should be left to the individual judgment.

With this argument Mr. Arnold does not even attempt to cope, but contents himself with playful sarcasms, vague generalisations as to the Philistine defect in delicacy of perception, and a repudiation of the Bible as a guide in the question of marriage.

As a last illustration, our author deals, in his lightest and most graceful manner, with the topic of Free Trade and its results, condemning the whole as unworthy of the assistance and furtherance of the disciples of culture.

That together with Free Trade, and the consequent increase of wealth and population, various social problems, including pauperism, have grown up and assumed alarming proportions must be admitted. But at the same time it must be borne in mind, that though the absolute number of paupers has increased, the relative number, as compared with the whole population, has diminished; so that the great development of commerce and manufacture holds out some slight hope of eventually remedying the evils attendant upon the consequent abnormal increase of population.

Mr. Arnold pictures in vivid language the misery of such a population as that in the East End of London, its poverty, wretchedness, degradation, and asks whether these things should be so? His picture is nearly as true now as it was then, and his question equally pertinent—whether “the dear God who loveth us and made and loveth all,” can be pleased that these things are so? Whether the constant increase of trade, wealth, and population can ever set them right or not rather serve in the long run to multiply the dangers and add to the difficulties? And then, having given his wrath full scope, suggests his remedy, and what is that remedy?

To adopt the Hebraistic plan of giving to the workers an additional share in the profits arising from their labour? No. To foster among them sobriety, cleanliness, thrift; to educate them so that they may be the better able to rise from their miseries? No. To establish among them mutual or charitable societies to assist the most distressed; to provide them with cleanly and airy dwellings? No. These all come under the condemnation that they are Hebraistic, practical, and unfit for culture to meddle with. His startling, profound, and eminently common-sense suggestion is that culture should be brought to bear on the weltering ignorant masses to convince them that they should no longer continue to propagate their species, because they have not the means to bring up their children in decency.

Thus he calls, not for any sacrifice on the part of the well-to-do portion of society, not for any of that bearing of one another's burdens which should be a characteristic of a professedly Christian community, not for a free-handed or organised distribution from the abundance of the few to minister to the necessities of the many, but for an additional self-denial on the part of those whose lives are already well-nigh void of pleasure, a suppression of the most powerful of instincts on the part of those whose misfortune it is to have been born in a condition most nearly approaching that of the mere animal, a self-control which can only be developed in indi-

viduals from the education of successive generations, and which to pervade a whole class would probably be the work of at least a century.

Mr. Arnold's reasons for withholding, as a believer in culture, all assistance from the Free Trade movement were as weak as the suggestion to which we have last referred was ridiculous. Firstly, he was at variance with many of its supporters. Secondly, he was painfully conscious of many of the evils that have attended it. It does not seem, however, to have occurred to him that it is not always advisable to judge of a cause by the utterances of its most enthusiastic and consequently most fanatical advocates; or that those results which are most immediately apparent are not necessarily ultimate and most important. He saw that by Free Trade wealth and population have been wonderfully increased, and that the poverty and misery, which, while widely distributed, could be easily overlooked and conveniently ignored, have by its concentrative power been revealed in all their nakedness and bitterness. He did not see, or gave no signs of seeing, that through it the solidarity of nations might come to be acknowledged, that by the inter-dependence of nations resulting from it obstacles would be raised in the way of international strife which may in time come to be invincible, and that by the aggregation of the individually helpless unity and the power of combination are placed within their reach, which is now rapidly tending to procure some approach towards justice in the distribution of the increment of wealth.

The case of Free Trade is, in fact, exactly one of those in which the sympathetic aid of the disciples of culture is most necessary, with a view to impressing on employers and employed a sense of their common interests and relative duties, and thus averting a threatened war of classes, a result which will never be brought about by supercilious reserve or sneering criticism.

We have now followed Mr. Arnold through his argument and illustrations, and have endeavoured to point out to what extent we agree with him in his enumeration of the evils of the present system of social life with its accompanying institutions, political and ecclesiastical, pointing out at the same time wherein we differ from him in his estimate of the nature of the evils of which he speaks, wherein we believe he has mistaken symptoms of revival for signs of decadence, and wherein we think his remedy likely to be beneficial and where harmful.

We shall not have completed the task we have set before us unless we point out that all the social evils at which we have glanced are but symptoms of a deep-seated disease pervading society at large, with which it behoves each individual, and especially those who are regarded as teachers of men, to grapple most earnestly.

England has been, and still is, passing through a transitional

epoch—an epoch of destruction and clearing away of old forms and systems preparatory to a reconstruction of society upon a firmer and truer basis, of which some signs are already making themselves visible.

"The old order changeth giving place to the new," but while the changes have become painfully evident—for it is impossible to view without pain the fall of institutions which in the past have wrought mighty and good works—the arrival of the new order is thus far but dimly perceptible.

The ideal "God" of the past has been destroyed by a flood of Iconoclasm, the ideal "God" of the future is thus far earnestly sought after but not seen. All unity of purpose has been broken up by wave on wave of doubt and denial as to the truth of the central fact upon which society itself must be based to be enduring. Reverence has wellnigh fled from among us and with it all loyalty worthy of the name.

While priests have been teaching dogmas which common sense repudiates, while science and orthodoxy have been hurling curses and denunciation at one another and philosophers have been vainly endeavouring to define the infinite and bring "God" within the comprehension of man, the bands of society have been loosened, society itself has become disintegrated, from similarity of interests, has rushed together again into classes and each class has made the principle of its life selfishness, bounded only by the endurance of its opponents.

Despite the traditional hauteur of aristocrats and the rabid destructiveness of communists, despite the logic of political economists and the eloquence of Free Trade fanatics, there is comfort in knowing that the laws of Nature have not changed, that a lie cannot live, and consequently that a society based on so monstrous a lie, so great a libel on humanity, so outrageous a repudiation of all the teachings of experience, must rapidly pass away. Selfishness as a basis for the reconstruction of society is an absurdity, implying as it does a war of class against class, of man against man, the existence of malice, hatred and all uncharitableness, and can only end in the triumph of the powers of darkness, anarchy, chaos, the apotheosis of the devil.

Facilis est descensus Averni. We have sunk somewhat in this direction, but always with such staying and modifying influences at work that it is not Utopian to hope for and even to expect far better and higher results. Harmony is the one thing needful, and even now the keynote strikes faintly on the ear, faintly, but with an ever increasing body of sound, which promises in time to influence all hearts and charm them back from darkness into light, from chaos into order.

It is upon this point of suggesting a remedy for the evils of the

time that Mr. Arnold most lamentably fails. The development of the intellect, the bringing to bear of culture upon the troubles that arise, are doubtless good, but must be ineffective as long as the cry is "Canst thou not minister to a mind *diseased*?" The danger is not that culture will not make progress—it is inevitable that it should—but that the moral sense will not develop with it. What is necessary is that men, whether sufficiently educated or not to appreciate the teaching of culture, should be influenced by the same faith, the same loyalty. The teaching that is most wanted in all classes is not from the intellect inwards, though that is good, but from the heart outwards.

To adopt a quotation which Mr. Arnold has used in his book as an argument in support of an Established Church, when he himself disdains to believe the dogmas which it teaches, Joubert has well said "The same devotion unites men far more than the same thought and knowledge." And it is this "same devotion," which must become a realised fact in order that society may display that unity which is sought after by all true lovers of their race.

It may seem strange, but it is undoubtedly true, that to ensure this we shall have to fall back upon the central teaching of the grand old Hebrew Bible, that *there is one God before all, beyond all, and supreme over all*. Our conception of the attributes of "the Holy One that inhabiteth eternity" may, and no doubt will, vary and develop in the future as they have done in the past. But this great central truth must inevitably come to be believed. Whether experience demonstrates that there is "an Eternal, not ourselves, that maketh for righteousness," whether we adopt the Bible teaching as an inspired revelation, or whether the discoveries of science throw us back upon an unknown first cause to which we attach attributes derived from the study of Nature and of man—the conclusion is the same.

There is one God worthy of our devotion, and whose laws are those of righteousness.

The wisdom of the advice of the writer of Ecclesiastes—"Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man"—has been confirmed by the experience of nearly 3000 years, and the business of the teachers of the present is to strive to impress upon all its truth. The fact that the laws of the Eternal are based on righteousness, and that peace and happiness, as well for nations as for individuals, can be obtained in no other way than by acting in accordance with those laws, is supported by so large a mass of evidence as to be wellnigh demonstrated.

With the relations of the individual to that *God* we have here but little to do; for devotion may arise towards the same power in different hearts, with entirely different ideas as to its nature. So that whether the Eternal be regarded as a personal deity, the

almighty and loving Father of the human race, or whether it be revered as an impersonal power, the law of the existence of which is that it should "make for righteousness," the same laws demand the obedience of all, the grand summary of which, as regards the dealing of man with man, class with class, nation with nation, is, "Do unto all men as you would they should do unto you." And belief in, and conscientious endeavour to act up to, this precept must needs effect the extinction of anarchy by means of the multitudinous and much needed reforms necessary for a reconstruction of society.

B. N. OAKESHOTT.

EIN STERBENDER.

(*From the German of THEODOR STORM.*)

THERE at the window sits a worn old man,
 So idly beating on the moistened glass ;
 Grey is the winter mist and grey his hair.
 At times he scans with sad attentive gaze
 The leaping arteries on his withered hand ;
 His end is near ; all heedless roams his eye
 O'er tables where, awaiting him in heaps,
 Piled high and higher documents arise.
 In vain ! for what he once achieved each day
 Is now a mountain he may cross no more.
 And yet from out his grief there steals a smile
 Derisive of his inward self as once :
 " Meseems a legal paragraph in stone
 Well-hewn would be no foolish epitaph."
 He turns, and with his eyeballs glaring bright
 Stares at the thin and empty air again,
 And goes on beating on the window-pane.
 A sudden brightness comes : a soft pale ray
 Of winter sunshine steals within the room
 And rests upon a picture on the wall.
 There, from the frame, appears a maiden's face,
 Fresh with the pearly dew of distant youth ;
 And from those huge and half-amazing eyes
 Flows promise of all earthly blessedness.
 He knows the world that came from those red lips
 No other knew. Remembrance holds him fast ;
 A sense of mystery subdues his soul ;
 So sweet, so soft the incense-breathing air !
 With scent of roses is the garden rich,
 On all the bushes rests the sun's bright glow :
 The bees are humming, and a maiden's laughter
 Flies sweet and silvery through the summer day.
 His ear is drunken. " Oh, once more, once more !"
 In vain he lists, and sobs and sinks his head.

“Death came to thee. Where art thou? Is there spot
In the whole universe that holds thee now?
For that thou once wast mine, that God Unknown
Gave to the Man the Wife as helpmate here—
Why this sea-deep and most delightful draught
That tastes the sweeter as one drinks it more
Leaves me to doubt of Immortality:
Since all the bitterness and need of life
Are thousandfold repaid; and there beyond
To hope or to desire is not for me.”
His arms he stretches in the empty void.
“These very rooms, where once thy life was led,
A radiance of thy beauty still illumines
For me alone, e’en when these eyes are shut,
Not dim, although no other may behold.”
Before him stands a glass of dark-red wine;
And tremblingly he stretches forth his hand
To quaff it slowly, but the wine itself
Gladdens his heart no more; down drops his head.
“That Thing we call the Soul will slumber soon,
And enigmatic Night is drawing near.”
His thoughts unconscious fly far far away,
And chase each other in unmeasured space.
But, hark! a song to bear him upward swells,
And from the church the choral strains arise!
Thus with his inward eye before the Cross
He scans both Man and Woman worshipping.
They gaze into the dark abyss of Night;
But from their tearful eyes a glory gleams,
As though they in the fountain-source of light
Beheld the roseate hues of Life reborn.
“They dream,” he speaks in accents soft and low,
“And all these garish shapes make up their joy.
But yet I know that ’tis the fear of Death
That hatched them in the brain of brooding man.”
With hands outspread he casts those dreams away.
“With all my failings one fault ne’er was mine;
My reason I have never cast in chains
For all the promises that might allure;
The rest in peace and patience I await.”
With clear eye casts the grey old man around,
And, while the shadows deep and deeper fall,
Uplifts himself and crawls from chair to chair.
At last he seats himself beside the desk,
Where the lamp shone so oft on hard night-toil.
Once more he writes; but still the pen relucts,

Wont only to perform the meed of Life,
To pass into the ministry of Death ;
At length he forces it ; for his strong will
Fain would fulfil its utmost possible.
The clock with solemn pendulum denotes
Each weary second as it flies away ;
His eye grows dim ; unseen the Spectre comes
To snatch the pen from out his feeble hand.
Yet toilsomely he writes in letters large
As darkness falls like ashes o'er his words :
“ Let no priest hold a service o'er my grave ;
Words are they merely for the winds to seize
And scatter, yet shall no such protest plead
Against the man I was with solemn curse,
When everlasting silence wraps me round.”

MAURICE TODHUNTER.

On the night of the eruption she was awakened about eleven o'clock by a tremendous noise and a series of earthquakes, which continued until about one o'clock. The earth shook continuously, and after this the volcano exploded, large red-hot stones, ashes, and mud being showered in all directions.

"Most of the surrounding natives gathered in my whare. Presently huge stones were hurled on the top, nearly smashing it in. They all wanted to run out, but I would not let them, saying they would certainly be killed.

"At intervals we would hear a cry and some poor creature would crawl into my whare with head and hands bleeding from the wounds made by the descending projectiles.

"For some time longer we heard cries for help, which we could not render.

"The stones now crashed through the windows, and the ashes began to fill our place, so we piled the furniture against the windows to keep them out as much as possible.

"There were now about fifty people taking shelter. At ten o'clock it abated somewhat, and we all crawled out through a narrow passage we cut and made our way back into the village. It was quite dark but I succeeded in saving several other lives.

"A few days later we were searching the remaining whares, and saw a stick being rammed through a hole in one of them, in which some white people found a native priest. They told some Maoris to dig him out, but they wanted to leave the old man there, saying that it was all owing to his actions that the eruption happened. It appears that he had told the guides that he would bring some disaster upon the country, as they took all the tourists' money and did not give him any."

The above narratives must, of course, be taken with the proverbial grain of salt, as the natives are a little given to exaggeration and carried away by superstition.

The next morning we made up a party, starting at seven o'clock, under the guidance of Warbrick. As we mounted our horses, we saw a large column of water shot up from the noted "Pohutu."

This geyser, when spouting, is about 8 feet in diameter and 80 to 100 feet in height.

We had to ride for ten miles across a very wild country, the track following the old road to the Terraces through the Tikitapu bush.

We soon saw traces of the eruption on all sides, the once noted bush being covered with ashes and dead trees, but the undergrowth is now regaining some of its former beauty.

Passing Lake Tikitapu, which was once a magnificent blue, we found it now whitened by pumice boulders and dust, washed out of

the mountain side. The next lake passed is Rotokakahi, where the same hue also prevails.

The track in places was very bad, having to thread our way over and between huge boulders for a long distance; but the animals provided happened to be very sure-footed and we arrived at Wairoa without mishap. Here we left the horses, and had a look at Sophia's whare, which is in exactly the same state as it was left after the eruption.

We also saw the ruins of McGray's Hotel, where Mr. Bainbridge, the Englishman, was killed. This building, together with the whares and houses surrounding it, give startling evidence of that eventful night. We also came across a buggy which had just been dug out in the recent excavations.

On all sides is a scene of utter desolation. We now had to walk a little distance to the creek of Lake Tarawera, passing on the way the Wairoa Falls, which before the eruption were very picturesque.

From here a Maori crew rowed us nine miles across the lake to the foot of the volcano. This lake has completely lost its former beauty, and is also of the same milky colour. The guide told us that during the eruption it rose 28 feet. He pointed out the places where the Maori villages lie buried beneath the ashes, in one of which alone fifty-two natives perished.

As we approached we obtained a fine view of the mountain, and landing at the junction of Lakes Tarawera and Rotomahana we commenced the climb.

It was an excessively hot day, and we found that we had a hard task before us. As we ascended we were shown the supposed position of the buried Pink and White Terraces by the shores of Lake Rotomahana, also the top of a pinnacle, which before the eruption was standing on dry ground; now it is nearly covered by the water of the lake. By its height, Warbrick said that he knew the depth of the lake at this point was 800 feet, and that it was filled up in one night through the effects of the disturbance.

The surrounding hills and valleys are, of course, covered with lava, and give one the impression of the furrows of an immense ploughed field.

The first stop we made was at the first crater, at which spot a great many explorers give up the ascent. There is now a rise of 1000 feet in a very short distance, and we saw several crevices and holes, with smoke and steam issuing forth, also what is known as the "Great Rift," which is in the side of the mountain, and certainly is a grand sight. Here one can partially realise the tremendous force of the explosion.

The way from this point is very bad owing to the rocks, huge stones, and lava, which are strewn in all directions, and we were

obliged to be careful not to send a rock crashing on to our friends following below.

When at last we reached the summit, the vastness of the spectacle was appalling, and it certainly surpasses one's expectations. There are five large craters, and the length of the cavity which was rent in the mountain is $2\frac{3}{4}$ miles, and over half a mile in width, and when I mention the fact that it is from 1000 to 1200 feet in depth, it will then give one a slight impression of its size.

The sight is an experience to be remembered for a lifetime.

The craters are still hot, and if a stick is thrust into the fissures near the edges, it will immediately ignite.

The ascent in all took us about two hours.

Our guide informed us that a boat passing on its way to Liverpool at a distance of 700 miles, had showers of ashes over it from the volcano. He also said that the Terraces were buried under about 200 feet of lava and ashes, and that although they are generally supposed to have been swallowed up during the earthquake at the time of the eruption, he contends that the White Terraces are not destroyed.

Searches have since been made to ascertain their exact position, but without success, as the physical features of the adjoining country are so altered by the effects of that eventful night.

There is a magnificent panorama from the top of the mountain. On one side the sea is visible, sparkling in the distance behind White Island, and also Mount Egmont; on the other side, part of the King country, and several mountains and lakes. Of course the intervening country is a dull, black monotony of lava and ashes, and at our feet lie Lakes Tarawera and Rotomahana.

Nearly all the geysers and hot springs were affected by the outbreak, which produced some very curious results.

The mountain was formerly supposed to have been an extinct volcano and was covered with bush.

During the eruption, which occurred on a Wednesday night, Warbrick told us that the lightning darted continuously downwards from a very black cloud which hung over the volcano, and the noise was heard hundreds of miles away, all over the islands.

He was in the vicinity on the Monday following, but the air was then so bad that they had to cover up their mouths.

The descent only took us about forty minutes, as we dug our heels into the fine ashes on one side of the mountain and slid down most of the way to the bottom; the only inconvenience we experienced was a boot-full of powdered ashes.

We now discovered a small stream, which subsequently proved to be a soda spring, which our guide informed us was not in existence two days previously, and that it was the first that had been found.

springing from the volcano since the catastrophe in 1886. Needless to say, we did not lose much time in availing ourselves of it after our hot and tiring journey, finding it beautifully cool and tasting exactly like soda and milk.

On our return a head wind had sprung up, making the lake rather rough, and it was all the Maoris could do to row us back to Wairoa.

We arrived at Whakarewarewa just as the sun was setting, closing one of the hardest but at the same time most enjoyable days that we had ever spent.

F. C. T. MANN.

SCIENCE AS A MORAL GUIDE.

MANY people at the present day feel dissatisfied with the system of ethics taught by Christianity. This feeling of dissatisfaction is not new as a phenomenon, for it has been felt by all reformers; and it generally arises when any religion has become so popular as to be merely a handle for respectability, and an instrument by which those who are in power can further their own interests. Christ felt it when He denounced the teaching of the Scribes and Pharisees; and Luther felt it when he denounced the exactions of the Catholic priests.

The objection generally brought to the Christian teaching is that it offers to those who do well only a doubtful reward in the next world, and seeks to deter us from doing wrong by the fear of an everlasting punishment. There is a general feeling that these are unworthy motives for doing good, and that we want some law which will appeal to the better and more reasonable part of our nature. Some say that we should do good to others because it is our duty to do so, without any hope of reward or fear of punishment. But, if we give up the guidance of Christianity, where does the duty come from? Others say that we should do good to our neighbours because we wish to do so in our highest and best moments. But how are we to know which are our highest and best moments?

Others, again, say, "Why should we do good to our neighbours? We are naturally selfish; why should we trouble ourselves about other people's welfare?"

In my opinion, the only true solution to these difficulties is to be found in the teaching of science.

Let us see what the doctrine of Christ really consisted in. He summed up His teaching thus:

"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; and thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself."

Is not this a little involved? If we love God with all our hearts, how can we have any love left either for our neighbours or ourselves? Does He mean that our love for our neighbour is to be merely a part of the love which we owe to God? Are we to love him merely as an emanation from God, and because God created him?

. But why should we love a Ruler who is so vindictive and unjust

as God represents Himself to be? And has He given us any reason for loving our neighbour as ourselves?

Several reasons are given in the Sermon on the Mount:

"Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth.

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.

"Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.

"Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you and persecute you, for great is your reward in heaven."

But do we *want* any of these things? Most of us would prefer a reward on earth to a reward in heaven, on the principle that "a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush." What we want is to be happy, whether we admit it or not; and science alone can teach us how to find happiness.

Christ says further:

"Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy."

Now, we know perfectly well that the merciful do not always obtain mercy in this world; and that they who mourn are not always comforted; and that those who hunger and thirst after righteousness are not always filled. And what takes place in the next world is far too doubtful to build our hopes on.

Science tells us that there can be no rational motive for any course of action except the attainment of happiness. And as most of us are so constituted that we cannot be happy while we see others looking unhappy, we try to help others to happiness also. Why do we wish to see others happy? Science explains that too.

It is because we are mutually dependent on each other's help. No man can live entirely alone; for men, as well as many other animals, have always found that they can immensely strengthen and protect themselves by living in communities. Probably this was done at first in order to protect themselves from the attacks of beasts of prey. If we could live entirely alone—that is, in isolated families, like lions and tigers—we should take no interest in each other's welfare, and feel no duty towards each other. The feeling of duty arises entirely out of the primary feeling of self-interest; as we are mutually dependent on each other's help, we have no *right* to be indifferent to the welfare of others. This feeling has been fostered by natural selection, because it is useful to the community, and whatever is useful to the community is useful to the individual. That is why we feel the wish to help each other.

But men, having developed multitudinous wants which are unknown to other animals, and having carried division of labour to its present extent, are far more dependent on each other than are wild animals which go about in herds. That is why our duties to our neighbours are so much more varied and more involved than are those of wild animals. Division of labour, as we all know, is not

practised by men alone; many different animals have found its advantages. In Kehl's *Travels in Russia* there is an extremely interesting account of the habits of the wild horses which roam about the steppes of Southern Russia. They go about in herds, in order to protect themselves from the wolves, with which they have pitched battles. These are their tactics: the mares form themselves into a compact circle, with the foals in the centre, while the horses gallop about outside, and do their best to drive off the wolves. Now, if these horses lived separately, in single families, they could not possibly defend themselves against the wolves. The wolves also go about in herds, because they find they can thus strengthen themselves. They do these things out of self-interest; I do not suppose they feel any duty to each other. But the interest of the individual is so bound up with the interest of the community that it cannot possibly be separated from it; and this generates a feeling of companionship and a pleasure in each other's society, which, among the more highly-organised animals, has developed into that love for our fellows which has blindly sought to express itself in Christianity and other religions.

This feeling is very well illustrated by the habits of kittens or any young animals in a nest. You will notice that they huddle together in order to keep warm. And, by so doing, they keep the others warm as well as themselves. This necessity for warmth and comfort generates a pleasure in each other's society and an interest in each other's welfare, which develops into fraternal affection.

Unfortunately, however, among men, civilisation and the possession of money have considerably diverted these healthy instincts from their natural channels, and have brought about two very unfortunate results. The first is that the possession of money enables a man to gratify all his personal wishes without feeling that he owes any duty to the community, or without being obliged to work in any way. By paying in gold for what he receives he fancies that he makes himself entirely independent; whereas he is really living on the labour of others, who are very often insufficiently paid. This gives rise to selfishness. These men say, "Why should we trouble ourselves about the welfare of others? We are quite satisfied with things as they are." If they could see things as they really are, they would find that they are in reality neglecting their own interests—as did the French nobles before the Revolution; for their indifference to the welfare of others brought them to the scaffold.

Again, the possession of money enables a man to enjoy the pleasures of marriage without incurring its cares and responsibilities. A man who does this wrongs society. This form of selfishness, too, sometimes brings its own retribution with it, as in the case of the late Mr. Edgar Holland, who was murdered by his former mistress.

The second result which I mentioned is far less common than selfishness. It is an abnormal development of unselfishness; and it is simply a reaction from the first. It finds its outlet at the present day in a great deal of sentimental talk about the necessity for altruism, the virtue of unselfishness, the beauty of a life of self-sacrifice. If these doctrines were consistently carried out by every one, they would end in the breaking-up of society and general confusion; because the first duty which society requires of us is to support ourselves, and our children, if we have children. And as most people are employed in doing so, why should they profess to condemn selfishness, and speak of unselfishness as a virtue? Why not admit at once that selfishness is a very useful instinct, and that we should be very badly off without it? This would be at least consistent; for no society could be kept up without selfishness as a basis. If we were to neglect our own interests, and go about looking for opportunities to do good to others, we should end by becoming a burden to the community, and so do more harm than good. Fortunately, however, this feeling is in general confined to idle people who have enough to live on without working. Naturally enough; because those who are employed in doing useful work have not time to think of these things; and the feeling that they are doing some useful work in itself generates content.

This enthusiasm of humanity, as it is sometimes called, is largely felt by girls of the upper middle classes, during the years which intervene between school-time and marriage. The middle-class girls are the worst off in this respect. Girls of the poorer class are obliged to go out to work, and girls of the upper class are taken about to balls and other social functions, because they are expected to marry. But the fate of the middle-class girls, in these countries, is generally left to chance. They are, therefore, in an anomalous position; there is no exact place cut out for them. They have nothing to do but play lawn-tennis and work for bazaars. They do not, generally, like this kind of life; for most of them are brimming over with energy for which they can find no outlet. Many of them, therefore, ask themselves: "Why was I created? I am of no use to society; I am doing nothing. Can I not at least do something to lessen a little the suffering which I see around me?" It is this feeling which makes so many young ladies at the present day take to hospital nursing. Now, hospital-nursing is fearfully hard work, and we all know that only the very strongest of women can continue at it for any length of time without injury to themselves. I never could see why men should not be trained to nurse men. I think the feeling that nursing must be done by women is merely a traditional one.

The other people who are carried away by the enthusiasm of humanity are for the most part invalids, or those who have been

otherwise unfortunate; people of both sexes who have been crossed in love; and, in short, they are nearly always idle people who have time and money on their hands. Now, I don't wish to say anything against philanthropists; I have no doubt that a great deal of good has been done by them. But I should think better of these professional angels if they were not so fond of sacrificing others as well as themselves. To preach to young people, and especially young women, that self-sacrifice is a virtue in itself, is, I think, extremely dangerous. Young people, who have no experience, and whose judgment is immature, cannot possibly know how to sacrifice themselves to the best advantage. And I have never found that the people who talk most about self-denial and self-sacrifice are the most unselfish. I fancy that the really useful people, with whom we cannot dispense, are not the philanthropists, but the carpenters, tailors, cooks, teachers, writers, musicians, &c., who are doing useful and necessary work, but who do not profess to be particularly unselfish. And if all men and women were supplied with useful work, and received sufficient pay, we should not need to have societies for the reformation of inebriates, nor homes for fallen women, because there would be little or no temptation for thieves, drunkards, and prostitutes.

These two states of mind are the extremes of selfishness and unselfishness. Both are unnatural, and are possible only in a civilised community. What we have to do is to try and find the right medium, as we have lost those instincts which with wild animals keep things at a proper balance. Only science can help us to do this.

The feeling that self-sacrifice is virtuous has its origin in the Christian doctrine of renunciation and mortification of the flesh, which was no doubt a reaction from the sensuous luxury of pagan times. Christianity teaches that it is a shameful thing to be an animal; that we ought to cultivate the spiritual side of our nature only, and fiercely repress all our animal desires and instincts. The lives of some of the Christian saints and martyrs are most instructive reading. Many of them were very superior people, and effected much good by their influence; but some, like St. Simeon, spent all their time in prayer and self-mortification. Sainte Genéviève, the Patron Saint of Paris, appears to have been a very charming woman; and she accomplished much good work. She thought it necessary, however, to live in the most ascetic style, eating only boiled beans and barley-bread, and fasting five days a week. The beans were boiled only once in two or three weeks, lest she should derive any pleasure from their taste. She lived on this diet till the age of fifty; then her spiritual adviser told her that it was her duty to add a little milk and fish. She was so humble-minded that she did not think of disobeying; but the sacrifice cost her many tears.

Although the saints of the present day do not go as far as this, we still have the feeling that carnal pleasures are sinful ; and many people, especially women, would never think of admitting that there could be any pleasure in eating and drinking. And they are not always those who take least pleasure in the things of the flesh. But science tells us that we *are* animals, and not disembodied spirits ; that diet is an extremely important department of life ; and that, if we neglect it, we make ourselves ill, and so injure both ourselves and others. Christians talk about the body and soul as though they were separate entities, which had only a temporary relationship. But science tells us that the body and soul, if not one and the same thing, are at least part of one another, and so intimately connected together that the health of the one is affected by the health of the other. We all know how impossible it is to form a just judgment on any point when we are tired or ill. These things are recognised now, and the athletic tendencies of the present day ought to do a great deal to counteract the morbid teachings of modern Christianity, by inducing healthiness of mind.

All kinds of pleasure being sinful, it was held to be highly virtuous, in the Middle Ages, for both men and women to shut themselves up in convents, where they spent their time in prayer and fasting, undisturbed by the sight of the other sex. And, although this form of virtue is not so much practised at the present day, we still have the feeling that the less we have to do with people of the other sex the better ; and young people are taught, especially girls, that it is extremely creditable to take no interest in the opposite sex. Those who do are put down as "flighty" and "frivolous," and we hear such scoffing remarks as, "Oh, of course, they like to be where the young men are !" Girls who wish to be thought modest and retiring proclaim loudly that they do not wish to marry. But science tells us that the sexes are mutually dependent on each other ; that neither can be complete without the other ; and that it is right and natural for young people of different sexes to wish to meet together. The Christian idea of propriety ordains that boys and girls shall be brought up quite separately, so that by the time they are ready to think of marriage they know nothing at all about each other. The term "as awkward as a schoolboy" has become proverbial ; but even a schoolboy is hardly more awkward than a young man of about twenty when he finds himself in the presence of women. Having mixed with so few of the other sex, these young people easily fancy themselves in love ; then they marry, and perhaps regret it all the rest of their lives. But, whether they regret it or not, Christianity tells them sternly that it is their duty to remain together ; that they were not put into the world to be happy, but to do their duty ; that marriages are made in heaven, and "whom God has joined let not man put asunder."

Science, on the contrary, would tell them that if they cannot make each other happy, nobody is the better for their remaining together.

The Christian standard of unselfishness is responsible also for a great deal of hypocrisy and humbug, as it is a standard that so few care to aspire to in deed. Men go to church on Sunday to be told, "And if a man take away thy coat, give him thy cloak also"; then they go home and spend the week trying to extort all they can from their neighbours. They pretend that they go to church to hear the sermon; but in reality they go because it is considered respectable to do so, and it is their interest to be considered respectable—that is to say, it is necessary to their profession or calling. What they really worship is the Golden Calf, and not the Man of Sorrows.

Again, we are told at church that "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked"; "For *all* have sinned, and come short of the glory of God"; "Have mercy on us, miserable sinners." Humility and self-depreciation form a very important part of the Christian doctrine. But how many men really believe that they are "desperately wicked"? I do not, for one. I do not think I am "desperately wicked." And what is more, though I have met two or three wicked people in the course of my life, and many deceitful people, I have never known personally any one whom I consider "desperately wicked." And I think science would tell us that if we were all as bad as our spiritual advisers inform us that we are, it would not be possible for society to continue even as well as it has hitherto done.

Although these people confess that they believe themselves to be miserable sinners, they also believe that when they die they are going straight to heaven, to meet their friends who have gone before, and to enter into an eternity of happiness. Yet they always speak of death as the most frightful calamity; they do all that they possibly can to prevent it; they are plunged in grief when they lose their friends, and they wear mourning to show that they are in sorrow. These inconsistencies show, I think, how little hold the teaching of Christianity has on the popular mind. The teaching of science is slowly but surely gaining ground; and even those who profess to be guided by Christian precepts are many of them votaries of science. Those to whom Christianity is really useful are, I think, only invalids and people who have been otherwise unfortunate, principally women, or those who are obliged to live alone. These people really believe that what they have missed in this world will be supplied to them in the next. But science, if we would only listen to her teaching, would show us how to do away with the necessity for this kind of consolation.

As, however, we cannot always calculate, before deciding on any course of action, what will be the best for the community, in

general it is safest to be guided by our healthy natural instincts, and to do the work which we wish to do. We can serve society much better by developing our talents than by repressing them; and if we are happy ourselves we are much more likely to promote happiness in others. Our instincts have been given us by Nature, and Nature always knows what is best for us. There are cases, of course, in which these instincts have been perverted by the influence of civilisation. These must be corrected by education; and here science comes in. I know that there are people who do not wish to do anything but sleep half the day, and hang about with their hands in their pockets the other half. But I think they are very few. All hard-working people imagine that it would be perfectly delightful to have nothing at all to do; but when they have tried it for any length of time they find it intolerable. Men who have been working all their lives, when at last they retire from business, find the idleness to which they had looked forward extremely wearisome. And I think that this love of idleness is partly the result of the unnaturally long hours imposed on working people, and partly of want of education. Professional men do not generally wish for idleness; when they take a holiday from their regular work they employ themselves in some other way. And those who make enjoyment the whole business of life do not succeed in finding happiness, as was proved long ago by the wisest of men.

Such tendencies as the abnormal love of drink, too, would be corrected by a more judicious diet and regular employment. All these unnatural impulses must be discouraged by education; and such education must be directed by science.

How much of our energies we ought to devote to our own personal interests, and how much to the interests of the community, is an extremely difficult question, and one which must be decided by each individual according to his abilities and opportunities. Very few have the necessary ability to be public benefactors and to act as guides and leaders to others; but all have it in their power sometimes to help their fellow-creatures; and they will be better able to do so if they take care also to help themselves.

H. E. HARVEY.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY AND WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION.

THE following article has been written on the assumption that the Parliamentary debates and newspaper articles prior to the passing of the Workmen's Compensation Act found other minds than the writer's own somewhat uninformed as to the purport of the legal doctrines involved, and often failed satisfactorily to answer questions raised by their perusal. It is scarcely necessary to say that it would be totally impossible to give within the scope of a single article a detailed and adequate account of employers' liability, both at common law and under the Act of 1880, the new Act, and their relation to each other; but a general view may not be useless within the limits imposed on it. References to cases alluded to are not given, as it was thought that they would not be required by the ordinary reader, and might be deterrent rather than attractive.

The history of employers' liability brings to one's mind an anecdote told by Mr. Augustine Birrell, in his entertaining volume of lectures on this subject, of an eminent lawyer who, when a request was preferred to him that one of the actual parties interested in a suit should attend consultation, refused with the words, "I will have no flesh and blood in my chambers." Before the Employers' Liability Act of 1880, "flesh and blood" seems to have had no further claim on the legal attention than as the occasion for subtle discussions and intricate problems. The Act of 1880 was a grudging concession to importunate clamour at the door; by the Act of 1897 "flesh and blood" has forced its way in and made an attempt not wholly vain to oust the lawyer from his sanctum.

A man is liable at common law if an accident has been caused by his personal negligence; for instance, a man driving his own carriage is responsible for any damage caused to passers by through his careless driving. This needs no further comment. But if his coachman runs over some one, not wilfully, but carelessly, he is also liable, provided the coachman is at the time employed in his service. If the coachman happens to be taking a jaunt in his master's carriage exclusively for his own amusement an action cannot be brought against the master; but, and here we come to a refine-

ment which is beyond the scope of ordinary lay intelligence, if the coachman, though not ostensibly on his master's service, has gone out of the way to effect some end of his own, the master will be liable. "Very hard on the master," we are inclined to exclaim if the coachman may be thus doubly erring.

Even when the coachman is actually employed on his master's business it is difficult to see why the latter should be responsible. The legal maxims *qui facit per alium facit per se* and *respondent superior*, are no real explanation—they savour of authority, and cases of delegated authority, whether general or particular, are not difficult to understand. But here the coachman has not been authorised to drive carelessly; indeed, he may very possibly have been expressly cautioned not to do so. It can only be said that a man who chooses to get his work done for him must be responsible for getting it done without inflicting harm on others, and there is the further practical consideration, in which we seem to catch sight for a moment of "flesh and blood" in the background, that the master can probably pay and the coachman improbably. If the Socialists win the day, it will be possible to form a juster estimate as to how far mere expediency is responsible for this doctrine, as it would then have to be upheld on purely logical grounds. It is of comparatively modern origin; in the fifteenth century, if a servant sold an unsound horse an action would not lie against the master for deceit, since the latter had not sold the horse himself to any particular person.¹

In the instance given above of a master's responsibility for the careless driving of his coachman, he is liable only to an outsider; to any one who has entered into a relation with him he is not liable, unless such liability forms a part of the contract; for instance, a friend whom he was taking for a drive could not bring an action against him for injuries sustained in an accident due to the coachman's negligence.

The much-abused doctrine of common employment, which is sometimes spoken of as though it were an exception to a general rule of liability, should rather be treated as a case of relation, where there is no agreement made as to liability. It has been explained by saying that a servant undertakes, in the service of his master, to run all ordinary risks which may be involved, including the negligence of his fellow-servants; but such an implied contract is purely fictitious, and has probably entered into the calculations of few or no persons when entering on an employment.

¹ A master is only liable for the criminal act of his servant if he is himself accessory to it, and would be liable apart from the special relationship of master and servant. There is also a certain class of cases described as quasi-criminal where the master is responsible for the injurious or illegal acts of a servant presumably acting under his authority. For instance, it was held that a baker using alum was responsible for seeing that it was duly diluted.

The doctrine of common employment was established in 1837, by a case in which a butcher's servant was sent in charge of some goods in a van driven by another of the butcher's servants; the van broke down and the former fractured his thigh; it was decided that an action would not lie against the master. Lord Abinger, in delivering judgment on the case, drew a truly alarming picture of the complications which might be expected to arise were it decided that a master was liable for the negligence of a fellow-servant—he would be responsible to his footman for the negligence of the harness-maker, to a servant if the chambermaid put damp sheets on his bed, to his household generally if the butcher sent meat damaging to the constitution; was it not part of a servant's duty to protect his master against the negligence of his fellow-servants, and would he not be inclined to neglect this duty if protected himself against the ill-effects of their negligence? It has been suggested that the present state of the law is in great measure due to these and similar ingenious analogies introduced in the judgment in this case; but, it may be remarked, they are all analogies from domestic life, and, as Mr. Birrell observes, "Bibulous, the butler," who breaks his leg over an inopportune coal-scuttle, suffers no pecuniary loss, and is restored to his accustomed regions by the tender care of the housemaid whose negligence caused the accident. Bibulous need not greatly excite our pity, and we may even doubt if the receipt of compensation might not make him less assiduous in impressing on the mind of Betsy that "all things have their proper place."

But we shall understand the hatred inspired by this doctrine better if we turn from domestic cases to such an one as this. A widow could not recover damages under Lord Campbell's Act because her husband, a railway servant, was killed in an accident caused by his fellow-servants, whose negligence he had no opportunity of checking. Or this: a widow was unable to obtain damages under the same Act, her husband, a miner, being regarded as the fellow-servant of the manager to whom his death was due. In cases such as these the hardship is obvious.

It may be as well, before going further, to explain briefly the provisions of Lord Campbell's Act. It is entitled "An Act for Compensating the Families of Persons killed by Accidents" (the word "accident" as here used must be understood as including wilful wrongs, and excluding those inevitable accidents called by lawyers "acts of God"). Before this Act was passed the rule held good that, where if a man had merely suffered injury, an action for damages could have been maintained; in the case of death his dependants had no remedy. Lord Campbell's Act transfers the right to recover damages from the dead man to his representatives only in the event of actual or prospective pecuniary loss; they are not entitled by it to receive a solatium for their grief, or to recover

compensation for funeral or mourning expenses, as neither would have been required if the injured man had lived.

Another well-abused doctrine is that known as contributory negligence. A master is not liable for negligence unless it can be shown that such negligence was the proximate or decisive cause of the accident; if it is proved that it was directly due to the servant's own negligence an action cannot be maintained against the master even though the accident was in large part due to his negligence. The partial culpability of the servant, if decisive in its effect, serves entirely to exonerate the master.

It is a general rule of law that a man who has willingly incurred risks cannot recover damages in case of accident, *volenti non fit injuria*, and attempts have been made by laying stress on a man's voluntary adoption of a dangerous trade to absolve the employer from liability; but the tendency latterly has been to decide that if the existing risks have been enhanced, or additional risks incurred, through the employer's negligence he cannot escape from liability. He is not indeed bound to provide the best machinery but only such as can with reasonable care be safely used.¹

It was the doctrine of common employment that roused that bitter opposition on the part of trade unionists which led to a Parliamentary inquiry into the state of the law, and finally to the Employers' Liability Act of 1880. "Common service" had been set up as a defence in the case of a miner who had been killed through the negligence of the manager; of a carpenter working at a railway station, where the accident was due to the negligence of porters; of a railway servant whose work of loading a "pick up" train entailed a short journey by rail to reach his work, and who was injured through the negligence of the guard. There could be no pretence in such cases as these that the injured man could or should have checked the negligence of his fellow-servants; but it was alleged that if the two had not a common immediate object, they had at least a common object; if it be asked what object a porter at a railway station has in common with a carpenter working on the roof, the reply is that this mysterious object has existence when the employment undertaken by one servant entails risk of injury from the negligence of another. Although it was sometimes alleged to be necessary in order that a master should be absolved from responsibility that the two servants should be not merely in common employment but engaged in the

¹ It is now regarded as a question of fact, to be settled by the jury in ambiguous cases, whether continued working under dangerous circumstances amounts to an acceptance of risk or not. The presumption is that when a man enters an employment involving obvious risks he is "volens"; if further risk is added it must be shown not only that its extent was appreciated but also that continuance was not to be explained by some other circumstance, such as a promise that the danger would be removed. When the risk arises from neglect of a statutory duty it must be proved that the workman knew both of the risk and also of the duty dispensed with by the master.

same common work within that employment, so wide an interpretation was placed on this common work, as may be gathered from the examples given above, that service to a common paymaster might almost be said to be a sufficient definition of their relation to each other. A master was only held responsible for personal negligence, or for that of his partner, or of a superintendent if an *alter ego*; in the case of corporations they were not held responsible for their managers, who were treated as fellow-servants of the employés. It was considered to be the duty of a master to entrust authority to competent persons, but he was not held liable if such persons proved themselves incompetent, unless negligence could be shown in their selection or continued employment; he was not, in short, required to warrant their competence.

If an agent appointed servants whom he knew to be incompetent, or provided machinery which he knew to be defective, the master would be liable because it would be a breach of the duty owed to his servants that the general conduct of the business should be such as is consistent with ordinary care and precautions.

There is, however, the further complication that it is by no means a simple matter to define the relationship of master and servant; the test in doubtful cases would be the power of instructing a person, not merely that a thing shall be done to meet such and such general requirements, but how the result shall be attained in accordance with particular instructions. If a man were to hand over a piece of work to his servant, and make a contract with him to do it for a given sum, the relationship of master and servant would be at an end as regards that particular piece of work, and the master could not be held liable for any accident which happened in the course of execution.

A Committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1876 to consider the desirability of altering the law. This Committee recommended that, when an accident occurred through the negligence of a servant to whom superintendence had been entrusted, he should not be regarded as a fellow-servant of the injured man, and that corporations and public bodies should be liable for the negligence of their agents.

The Employers' Liability Act of 1880, which has come in for a large share of vituperation in the recent discussion of this subject, was framed to carry out these recommendations. The first clause abolishes the doctrine of common employment in five instances, or rather the remedial nature of the Act being taken into consideration, it has been beneficially interpreted to that effect; strictly speaking, it only puts the workman in the same position as a stranger, and disregards the fact that were the said stranger on the premises as a trespasser or bare licensee he would have no right of action. The cases in which the Act sets aside the doctrine of common employ-

ment are as follows. A master is held liable when an accident happens through a defect in the "ways, works, machinery, or plant," if such a defect is due to his own negligence, or that of one of his servants whose duty it is to see that they are in proper condition, or by reason of negligence on the part of those entrusted with superintendence or authorised to give the order or direction which had caused the accident; or where the accident was caused by particular orders given by a person in authority, or by defective bye-laws, provided that bye-laws should not be considered defective if authorised by the Secretary of State or Board of Trade, or by the neglect of persons in charge of signal points, a locomotive engine, or a train on a railway. A workman could not bring an action against his employer if he had known of the defect or negligence which caused his accident, and had failed to give notice of it to the employer or some one in authority (under the common law such a complaint has to be made to the employer in person).

This Act applies to workmen within the meaning of the Employers' and Workmen's Act of 1875, by which seamen and sea-apprentices and domestic and menial servants are expressly excepted, and the test in doubtful cases is whether manual labour is a substantial part of a man's work or merely incidental to it—for instance, a distinction would be drawn between a light porter in a shop and a shop assistant.

The doctrine of contributory negligence is left entirely untouched by the Act, and there is no attempt to limit the doctrine of common employment to cases where it was within the power of the injured man to control his fellow-servant by means of observation or complaint.

There is no reference in the Act of 1880 to "contracting out"—*i.e.*, the power of the employer and workman to make a contract by which the latter agrees not to avail himself of the provisions of the Act; but it seems to have been contemplated by the Committee, and the right has since been clearly established. Sometimes the workman is induced to make such an agreement merely through fear of losing his means of livelihood by a refusal, sometimes by the proffer of advantages under some beneficial scheme framed by the employer himself. It is not possible within the limits of this article to enter fully into the question of such benefit societies, but it may be remarked that in the first place the bargainers are not equally placed, and, therefore, there is no guarantee that the bargain will be a fair one; and secondly, even where such societies are well and honestly managed, the employer gains an extra hold on his workmen, who fear to lose the benefit of the money they have contributed by leaving his service. Sentimentally there may be something to be said in defence of contracting out, but unfortunately, if due attention is paid to facts of the kind suggested above, they will be found to

outweigh the beauties of sentiment as illustrated in isolated instances of the paternal employer.

It has been thought necessary to go into these somewhat wearisome details as to employers' liability at common law and under the Act of 1880 in order that the radical changes effected by the new Act may be fully appreciated.

The Workmen's Compensation Act of 1897, which will come into force July 1898, is a measure of a recognisedly experimental character. It is limited in its application to workmen employed in railways, factories, mines, quarries, or engineering works, and to certain departments of the building trade. Although this Act applies to fewer trades, at the same time it must be remembered that the definition of "workman" under it embraces all persons occupied in employments within the scope of the Act, whether engaged in manual labour or not; for instance, clerks will be placed on the same footing as other employes.

This Act of 1897 is based on a wholly new principle. By it an employer is bound to compensate his workmen for injuries "arising out of or in the course of employment," not on the assumption that he is responsible directly or indirectly for the accident, that it has been caused by his own negligence or that of his servants. The principle involved is one of quasi-contract; the employer undertakes, with a single reservation, to indemnify his workmen for all accidents, however caused. The Act is intended to cover both such accidents as are due to negligence and such as are inevitable or could not have been foreseen. It would be a task of ill-omen to point out difficulties which will probably arise as to the interpretation of the words "arising out of and in the course of employment," but it may be suggested as unfortunate that the word "and" is not "or," as in that case there would be no room for apprehension lest "in the course of employment" should be limited by "arising out of" to such an extent that the former will be the real criterion, and the effect of the Act, therefore, by no means what was intended.

The only case stated in the Act where a workman is debarred from compensation is when it is proved that the accident was attributable to his own serious and wilful misconduct. (The original expression in the Bill was "solely attributable," but it was altered during its passage through the House of Lords.) This is a relic of the doctrine of contributory negligence; but the contributory negligence contemplated in the Act must be not only the decisive cause of the accident but must be proved to be an intentional act of disobedience on the part of the workman. It cannot be foreseen how far the interpretation put on this clause will tend to make it merely a rather narrower form of contributory negligence; but it is to be feared that it will give rise to much litigation, and the omission of the word "solely" is to be regretted on this account.

The doctrines of common employment and *volenti non fit injuria* have disappeared within the Act; but it must be remembered that when the circumstances of the case are such that it is actionable at common law or under the Act of 1880 the workman may choose whichever course of proceeding seems most profitable. If he has not recourse to procedure under this Act to start with he may fall back on it if his first action at common law or under the Act of 1880 has been unsuccessful; but an employer is not liable to pay compensation both independently of and under this Act. Further, the Act does not interfere with the employer's criminal liability, but provides that if he has been fined under any of the various statutes affecting factories and mines, and such fine has been paid to the injured workman, the amount shall be deducted from the compensation due under this Act. In order to deter workmen, or in case of death, their representatives, from wanton litigation, costs may be deducted in the event of the action being unsuccessful.

When an actual part of or process in the work of an employer or undertaker within the meaning of the Act has been given to a contractor and an accident occurs for which the employer would have been liable if the workman had been directly employed by himself, he will still be liable, but can recover the sum expended from the contractor if the latter is himself an employer within the meaning of the Act, or liable independently of it, or from any other person to whom the accident was due, provided such person was liable independently of the Act. The effect of making the employer responsible will be that in cases where the contractor or other person is unable to pay compensation the loss will fall on the employer instead of on the injured workman.

If an accident is due to the negligence of a stranger who would be liable independently of this Act, the workman may, instead of demanding compensation from his employer, and leaving him to recover that sum from the real culprit, bring an action against the stranger, but in that case he runs the risk that the latter may deny his liability on the ground of contributory negligence or otherwise. In the case of bankruptcy the injured workman will have a first charge upon any sum due from insurers to his employer in respect of the accident. It may be well to point out here that the German system of accident insurance deals with the difficulties arising from bankruptcy by throwing the responsibility not on the individual employer but on trade groups. The publicity involved makes it difficult to imagine English employers making such alliances; and, as regards prevention, it may even be doubted if individual responsibility will not be more efficacious. But on the other hand, there is no doubt that if the partial nature of the Act is remedied later on by its extension to trades in which the proportion of small employers is greater than in those now included, the danger that

workmen may forfeit compensation will be much increased. Mr. Birrell says of the German plan, "that there should be solidarity amongst employers is more a religious than a legal idea. It has its advantages, but it seems a very illogical halfway house between individual and State responsibility." It may be that the last-named will prove the truer and final solution.

Another important feature in the German system is that by it provision for accidents is made in accordance with two Acts, the Sickness Insurance Act and the Accident Insurance Act. All workmen must belong to benefit societies which are affiliated, two-thirds of the funds being contributed by the workmen and one-third by the employers, and in the case of sickness resulting from an accident the expenses must be borne by the friendly societies for the first thirteen weeks. In the event of death or of illness lasting more than thirteen weeks, compensation must be made in accordance with the Accident Insurance Act, and in this case the whole expense is borne by the employers' groups. By the English Act the employer is entirely responsible after the first fortnight, and, in order to prevent malingering the workman cannot claim compensation for the first fortnight, and no other provision is made for it.

The thorny question of "contracting out" still remains for consideration. Contracting out is not abolished by the new Act, but is only allowed under the following conditions. The Registrar of Friendly Societies has power to grant a certificate for five years or more in cases where an alternative scheme seems "on the whole not less favourable" to the workman than the provisions of the Act, such certificate being revocable if the Registrar thinks fit, and contracting out is only permitted where such a certified scheme takes the place of that set forth in the Act. Here again it is impossible to foretell what the actual result will be; it depends largely on the interpretation which will be placed on the words "on the whole not less favourable."

As this article has already reached a considerable length, and only professed to deal in a general way with the principles involved, practical details as to the amount of compensation, medical examination, dependents within the meaning of the Act, and the giving notice of accidents, will not be discussed.

A few words must, however, be said as to a striking feature of the Act, namely, the introduction of arbitration. Litigation and its attendant expenses, were felt to be one of the chief, if not the chief, ground of objection to the Act of 1880, and the new Act provides that any question arising as to proceedings under it shall be settled by arbitration. Questions of law may be submitted by the arbitrator or committee of arbitration to the county court judge (if the parties at variance cannot agree on the appointment of an arbitrator, it

becomes the duty of the county court judge to act himself unless authorised by the Lord Chancellor to appoint a deputy) and his judgment must be regarded as final except in the case of appeal.

The chief objections brought against this Act have been that it accepts accidents as inevitable, and makes no effort to prevent them; but there is every reason to hope that its effect will be in large measure preventive. It was the habit of an eminent judge, who regarded it as an unfortunate tendency of juries, and even of judges, to be over-sympathetic to the injured man, to warn the former in these words: "You must not suppose that people are negligent because experience has shown that something might have been done that previously was not done, otherwise our ancestors would be more and more negligent the further we go back." The new Act will not encourage employers to restrict themselves to the "reasonable" precautions which served for their ancestors, but will rather induce excursions into the field of what might be done to prevent accidents.

An objection which has been even more strongly urged is that the new Act will mean death to thrift and foresight on the part of the workman himself, as there will no longer be any inducement to him to save. It may very probably be that societies dealing with accidents only will, in cases where they are recruited chiefly from the ranks of workmen in the trades to which the Act applies, suffer collapse; but it is still left to benefit societies to provide for the first fortnight when compensation cannot be claimed, for sickness not caused by accident, and for old age.

Whatever misgivings may be felt about details, such as the commutation of the weekly payments to a lump sum at the end of a period of six months, if desired by the employer; whatever suspicions may be raised as to whether the wording of the Act ensures its being interpreted in accordance with the intentions proclaimed by those who framed it, it must at least be admitted that it is an advance on previous legislation on the subject, although it may need, and indeed must need, much modification and extension before it can be regarded as other than a partial and experimental measure. Unfortunately the result of contemplating such a measure, even as perfected in every imaginable way, is to make one feel that cases of injustice to one side or the other will still arise, although their present number is capable of considerable reduction. We find ourselves saying with Pascal: "*La justice et la vérité sont deux pointes si subtiles que nos instruments sont trop émoussés pour y toucher exactement.*"

MONA WILSON.

DEVELOPMENT IN THE IDEA OF THE STATE.

THE Indo-Germanic race is to politics what the Semitic is to religion. The work of the Aryans has been political civilisation. Not, however, until they entered Europe did this development become conscious. For our present purpose their European history may be divided into ancient, mediæval, and modern. In the first of these the Greeks and Romans led the world; in the second, the Teutons; while our present-day civilisation springs from a combination of Græco-Roman and Teutonic elements.

In Greece the State became for the first time the expression of conscious will. The Greeks sought a basis for it in human nature, and taught that in the State alone man arrives at maturity, happiness, and perfection. Socrates held that the State came into being with a view to the lower life, though it maintained its existence on account of the higher. Social life, he says, is founded on the fact that no man is self-sufficient. He who lives in isolation cannot supply his own wants. Co-operation is required. Particular individuals must devote themselves to the supplying of particular wants. Like Adam Smith, Socrates lays down the principle of the division of labour as the basis of social unity. But in the *Republic* the professions are separated from the trades, and Plato seems almost to abandon the idea that the State is a unity, of which all are members. Athens cultivated the few at the expense of the many, and the ideal State requires a lower class to do the less important work, so that the privileged may have leisure for the higher functions. Plato is guilty of taking an aristocratic view of the free citizen. He represents the spirit of his age in regarding mechanical occupations as slavish. He does not actually enslave the lower classes, but he speaks of them as incapable of culture. Thus he excluded the majority from the higher life, with the result that his State is not truly organic.

The Greeks, again, preferred isolated cities to a large State, because they supposed the latter must mean despotism. Freedom, they thought, could only be obtained in a municipality which controlled its own affairs. Aristotle has even observed that in the municipality we have the limit of self-sufficiency, that amount of

social unity requisite for human development. Thus in Greece there were "as many States as cities," and we find here a more exclusive patriotism than can be found in any later civilisation. For politics then included all the organisations of social life, all religious, literary, and educational institutions. In modern times these are regarded as separate departments, but formerly a single organisation performed every function; hence to the Greeks the State was naturally everything. But since it thus absorbed all interests, those classes which did not share its struggles were despised. Family life, one of the most important aspects of the State, was thrust into the background, and the legislation of both Athens and Sparta looked with a jealous eye upon the ties of kindred. Not only were the slaves converted into mere machines, but the women occupied an unfavourable position. All the States, in fact, were, more or less, aristocracies. Although Athens called itself democratic, this only implied equality among the full citizens; many of the inhabitants had no privileges. In reality there was no true democracy in this city; for the rights recognised were not those of man as man, but only those peculiar to Athenians.

Aristotle is more careful than Plato of the rights of the individual, and he also attaches more importance to the great institutions of marriage, the family, and private property. Further, he bases the State on a deeper principle. Socrates had erected it upon an external necessity—namely, the wants of the individual. But Aristotle finds an inner and positive principle in man himself. By nature, he declares, man is a social creature (*ὁ ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον*); he regards the State as a product of human nature, as the "moral order of the world in which human nature fulfils its end." It is only through the State that the individual acquires a legal existence; apart from it he has neither safety nor freedom.

The education and development of the individual also depend upon the State. Whereas Socrates and Plato held that a knowledge of the good was the most essential thing, Aristotle teaches that mere theory cannot produce virtue. Character must be already formed before philosophy can appeal to it with any power; and to realise a good character a man must be reared under good laws. Virtue exists first in a potential form, and it is the province of education to develop this. But all virtues are relative to society; for it is only in positive relation to some other being who possesses acknowledged rights that the first step in the moral life, the initial self-renunciation, takes place. The State develops the virtues of its members by teaching them good habits in youth, and by confirming them in these as they grow older; and Aristotle even says that this State restraint and moral education is indispensable to the citizen at any age.

Again, it is the State which determines the spheres of action of its subjects ; but according to Aristotle, there is no antagonism between the individual and the State. Should these happen to conflict, this indicates that the social nature of the individual is not fully developed, for each man progresses only in so far as he promotes the advancement of the State. So far as the end of the State is realised will the good of the individual be attained ; for the end of the State is the perfect life of the whole social organism, and this can be reached only through the perfection of every part. Thus the progress of the individual and of society proceed *pari passu* ; their influence is reciprocal.

It should be noticed that the Greek State gave no rights to those to whom it did not also give duties. With Plato, indeed, right and duty are but opposite sides of the same thing. In Aristotle they begin to be separated, and in Roman and modern law the separation is clearly marked. As the notion of the individual being a law to himself has gained ground, a distinction has been made between the legal and the moral ; for men have come to see that there are rights secured by the State in reference to which it does not lay corresponding duties on the subject.

In making its legal nature more distinct, the Romans, although they thereby limited the State, yet gave it greater power and firmness. The Roman mind was essentially practical, and was forced to modify the theories of the Greeks, where these proved impracticable. Thus this people did not regard the State as an indefinite "ethical ordering of the world," but sought to make it a concrete legal organisation. The Romans restricted, to some extent, the sphere and power of the State. Obedience was necessary indeed, if the State expressed its will ; but the Romans seldom interfered with the religious and social customs of conquered tribes. In Italy itself the family was more free than in Greece, and private rights and property were less at the caprice of authority.

Both in practice and in theory the Romans were greatly influenced by the doctrines of the Stoics. Though the Roman laws were not originally built upon these principles, yet they transformed them altogether at a critical period, and gave them that form which has been the model of all later legislation. For the Roman law had developed through three stages, represented by the patriarchal, the civic, and the Imperial law. Here the State had its genesis in military necessity. The "gentes" became united against the northern invaders ; but the civil law was no sooner established than it had to be widened by degrees, as the dominion of Rome extended from the capital, until all Italy, and finally the whole civilised world, bowed to her sway. The Imperial law was Rome's greatest work, and it is here that the Stoic principles became predominant. Before its adoption the privileges of Roman citizenship

had not been extended to all the provinces. The *jus gentium* had sufficed ; but it was now necessary to introduce a legal system based upon equality. The jurists therefore adopted the Stoic theory, that each man is a law and an end to himself, and must be allowed to govern himself without interference. They accepted the view that all men are by nature free and equal. This led them to condemn slavery, and, though unable to stop it, they were continually making inroads upon it. They made "manumission" easier, and punished masters for over severity. Again, they based the right of property upon "original occupation," believing that when an individual acquires a possession it becomes part of his personality in such a way that no one has a right to interfere with it. This further led to the institution of contract, by which property might be transferred from one man to another. Hereby was recognised that supremacy of the will taught by the Stoics ; for interference with the person or goods of another without his consent became punishable as a civil injury. The agreement of the individual was necessary to render a transaction legal. But this theory of contract only referred to man's private relations ; it did not apply to his connection with the State. This the political conditions of the time forbade. For the Roman Empire was not bound together by a social sentiment, but was a union of conquest. The Emperor, who was the leader of the army, was at the same time the legal executive, the only power to enforce the laws. This was inevitably so in a dominion founded, not upon right, but on military strength ; for the Emperor had to beware of delegating too much authority to a possible rival ; and this, as Tacitus shows, was the secret of that consummate policy of Augustus, when he united all the functions of government in his own person. While, therefore, by law no one could have property in another, the Emperor had property in all the citizens ; while these were self-governing in relation to themselves, they were slaves as related to the ruler. Yet, though thus including a phase of slavery, the main principle of Roman law was independence ; and the almost universal imitation of the Roman codes has profoundly affected the relation of the individual to the State throughout Europe.

The two powers in the Middle Ages, which in the one case transformed, in the other destroyed, the Roman Empire, were Christianity and the Teutonic race.

The former set up the Church as a "peculiar spiritual existence," distinct from, and independent of, the State. The dualism of Church and State implied that the latter was limited, and, indeed, it now became only a community of law and politics, no longer of worship and religion as well. With the institution of the Papacy the former conception of the universal dominion of Rome awoke again, but it now assumed a spiritual form. The Church never succeeded in

making the State a mere ecclesiastical appendage, though for a considerable period she far excelled it in glory. As ruler over men's souls, the Pope claimed precedence of the lord of their bodies; but the fact that the dualism was always recognised indicates that the State never wholly lost its independence. In the Middle Ages, however, the Holy Roman Empire of the Germanic peoples was transformed into the dominion of the Church.

In practical politics it was the Teuton who wrested the territories of Augustus from the hands of his successors. These warlike tribes became masters everywhere in the West. They came under the influence of Christianity and Roman civilisation; but the rugged, self-willed character of the people was to the prejudice of political organisations. Yet they have contributed most significantly to the development of the idea of the State. Montesquieu has remarked that parliamentary institutions found their birthplace in the forests of Germany; and it is mainly to the Teutons that we owe the great prominence attached by later systems of politics to the freedom of persons, corporations, and "estates." In his *Germania*, Tacitus describes how the Teutonic kings consulted with the chiefs on the one side, and with the freemen on the other; and here we may perceive the first form of that representative government which is the fundamental principle of the modern State. Among the Teutons the individual is supreme. He will, indeed, sacrifice part of his liberty to the State, but he does so only that the remainder may be the more secure. The Papacy had limited the rights of the State by those of the Church; the Teutons further limited them by the rights of the individual. They would acknowledge no absolute power in the State. Before obeying, they always claimed the privilege of discussion, and frequently the right of veto.

Thus the Teutons sowed the seeds of its freer development, but in the Middle Ages the idea of the State was not so powerful nor concrete as among the Romans; for the conception of the State as a collective person was scarcely intelligible to the Teutons. They broke it up into classes, each of which, now by strengthening, now by limiting the others, asserted its own freedom. This independence of the parts, however, was not counterbalanced by the integral unity of the whole. An attempt was made to preserve the latter by means of the feudal system; but this unity was always relatively weak, and was only preserved at all by sacrificing the common people, whose welfare was generally neglected. Feudal law was an attempt to establish the whole organism by degrading one of the parts.

The Renaissance affected political theories, but did not immediately influence existing institutions. While the Church had taught that temporal power was derived from God, and had regarded the progress of States as His work, Machiavelli's idea that policy was

the secret of strength now began to prevail, and the bolder thinkers tried to account for political authority and development by human considerations instead of theocratic explanations. The Renaissance, however, produced no fresh political organisation in its own day, but by bringing men more under the influence of ideas it helped to undermine the feudal system and to prepare the way for the modern State.

The distinctive features in the latest conception of the State will strike us most forcibly if we follow Bluntschli's method, and inquire wherein it differs from those already dealt with.

Contrasting, then, the modern with the ancient State, we find :

(1) A difference in respect to the rights of man. While, as we saw, the Greeks and Romans did not acknowledge real personal rights, and were opposed to individual freedom, the modern State recognises the natural rights of all citizens, and does not interfere with freedom, except for the general good. While formerly half the population might be slaves, who were a continual menace to the State, now slavery has been abolished, and the chances of internal revolt thus greatly diminished. Man has no longer property in man, for each is now regarded as a person, a subject of rights, and not a mere thing. All classes have now a political position in the State, and even servants and labourers may possess suffrage rights. Thus the State rests upon a broader basis ; the organism lives through the vitality of every part.

(2) The sphere of State action is now limited. In the past the idea of the State embraced religion and law, morals and art, and, indeed, the whole life of the people, now its chief aspects are the legal and the political. It no longer regulates religion, and, while it fosters science and art, its attitude towards these is that of patron, not dictator.

(3) Private and public law are now distinguished. The Romans had separated these in principle, but did not actually admit individual freedom as against the State. But the modern " person " exists for his own development, not for the particular ends of any ruler. The State, though not creating private law, yet recognises and protects it.

(4) The sovereignty of the State is now limited by the Constitution, not absolute, as before.

(5) The members of modern States express their wishes by means of representatives ; whereas the Athenians and the Romans met in great popular assemblies, their government being thus direct. But while in the *ἐκκλησῖαι* and the *comitia* there were many men unfit to consider matters upon which they were yet called to vote, and the orator might thus abuse his influence ; the selective principle in the modern State, and the respect paid to representatives form, to some extent, a guarantee of their capacity.

(6) The modern State is not a city State, as with the Greeks, nor

a world State, as the Roman; but is essentially a national State. Within it the city is only a community.

(7) The administration of the modern State is more effective. The legislative and executive functions are performed by different organs; formerly the same assembly usually exercised both.

(8) International law, in some form, is now acknowledged as a limit to the dominion of the State; it protects the weaker and prevents the universal empire of any people. In the past the boundaries of a State were relative to its military power, the Roman eagles alighting in all lands.

In comparing the modern State with the mediæval we find that the differences are due chiefly to religion and the feudal system.

(1) We now regard the origin of the State as human, not divine. Our view is based, not on theology, but on scientific principles and the teaching of philosophy and history. We try to understand the State as the work of man, Mill would say, and do not profess to comprehend the ways of God.

(2) We consider the authority of the State conditioned and established by public law, and repudiate the idea of an indirect theocracy. We refuse to see in the sovereign "the Lord's Anointed."

(3) Legal status is now independent of religious beliefs. We encourage freedom and toleration, and have ceased to persecute Dissenters.

(4) We grant no privileges nor immunities to the clergy; in the eyes of the law they stand on the same footing as laymen.

(5) While formerly the entire charge of education and the control of science were entrusted to the Church, the State now provides a secular education; science is not fettered by ecclesiastical authority; and it is only religious instruction which is in the hands of the clergy.

(6) Whereas under the feudal system the power of the State was divided and insecure, the king depending on the princes, the princes on the knights, and these on the burghers of the towns, the sovereign now claims direct from each subject an equal allegiance, and the power of the State is centralised in its head.

(7) The people have now a uniform representation; the nobility and the clergy no longer predominate, but the real power is in the hands of the citizens.

(8) The law is the same for rich and poor.

(9) Instead of being blindly determined by custom and instinct as in the Middle Ages, the State has now passed from consciousness to self-consciousness, it knows the principles on which it acts, and is becoming more and more the embodiment and expression of the reason of man.

ALEXANDER SMITH.

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH AND THE ROENTGEN AND OTHER X RAYS.

A GREAT poet once said, "We cannot express our inmost thoughts, they are incomprehensible even to ourselves. . . . In our present gross material state our faculties are clouded; when death removes our clay coverings the mystery will be solved." But if we accept the speculations—to use his own term—of Professor W. Crookes, F.R.S., which he promulgated at the Psychical Research Society, it will be no longer necessary to join in Shelley's pathetic confession of ignorance of the problems of life and mind. The discoverer of the tubes which have been the necessary medium for the Roentgen rays, it is true, advanced the hypothesis of telepathy, following the example of the Platonic Socrates in the *Phædon*, purely in a tentative spirit. But then Socrates was trying to prove the immortality of the soul, and rejected physical explanations of psychical phenomena as odious. This Professor Crookes does not do, partly because his problem is different from that of Socrates, and partly because psychical research is, and natural theology is not, a progressive science. Professor Crookes admitted that, even if we accepted the hypothesis of telepathy, we should be perhaps as far as ever from knowing what mind is. We only know that it is, and have an additional proof of its existence by the transmission of thought and images directly from one mind to another without the agency of the recognised organs of sense. Broussais, following the cerebric-physical school, boldly declared that mind is "Un cerveau agissant, et rien de plus." But Professor Crookes said: "We may explain molecular and molar motions and discover all the physical laws of motion, but we shall be as far as ever from the solution of the vastly more important question as to what form of will and intellect is behind the motions of molecules, guiding them and constraining them in different directions along predetermined paths." Professor Crookes makes a more explicit confession of ignorance as to what mind is than Socrates did when he attempted to define a cause. Professor Crookes admitted that psychical science is yet in a nascent stage only. But he predicted that "psychical science as pursued by the Society of Psychical Research is the embryo of something which in time may dominate the whole world of thought." As reported

in the *Times*, that portion of Professor Crookes' address which referred to telepathy ran as follows: "Passing thence to the speculation of Professor W. Jaines, of Harvard, which dealt with the possible difference in rapidity of sensations on the part of beings presumably on a larger scale than ourselves, Professor Crookes applied the general conception of the impossibility of predicting what unseen forces might be at work around us, specially to telepathy, or thought transference, *i.e.*, the transmission of thought and images directly from one mind to another without the agency of the recognised organs. Was it inconceivable," he said (after making an elaborate calculation as to the vibrations which produce sound and light), "that intense thought concentrated by one person upon another with whom he was in close sympathy, should induce a telepathic chain along which brain-waves should go straight to their goal without loss of energy due to distance? Such a speculation was," he admitted, "new and strange to science; it was at present strictly provisional, but he was bold enough to make it, and the time might come when it could be submitted to experimental tests." The *Times*, in a leading article criticising this address, said telepathy was conceivable, but asked if it was true. The leading organ even went so far as to declaim that the hypothesis of Professor Crookes involved *l'abus de l'inconnaissable*. But, according to an extract from his Presidential Address, given in the *Lancet* of February 6, Professor Crookes explicitly declares that by adopting the hypothesis of telepathy "no physical laws are violated, neither is it necessary to invoke what is commonly called the supernatural." If the supernatural is not invoked it cannot be said to be abused. The connection between the newly discovered Roentgen ray and telepathy is thus demonstrated: "We are introduced to an order of vibrations of extremest minuteness as compared with the most minute waves with which we have been hitherto acquainted. It has been demonstrated that these X rays, as generated in the vacuum tube, are not homogeneous, but consist of bundles of different wave-lengths analogous to what would be difference of colour could we see them as light, some passing easily through flesh, but partially arrested by bone, while others pass with varying facility through bone, but less easily through flesh." In the annotations of the *Lancet* (February 6, 1897), the passage is quoted and the article continues: "Professor Crookes considered it possible that other X rays exist in which vibrations are of a more extreme minuteness, as there is no reason to suppose that we have reached in the Roentgen rays the limit of frequency, and that some of these unknown rays may supply the key to much that is now obscure in psychical phenomena, as in telepathy—'the transmission of thought and images directly from one mind to another without the agency of the recognised organs of sense.' By adopting such an hypothesis no physical laws are violated, neither is it necessary to invoke what is

commonly called the supernatural." Objections, he allowed, may be taken to this hypothesis; but, in making objection to, or in answering these, it must be remembered that we cannot express life in terms of heat, or of motion, and other purely physical conditions. Doubtless molecular movements strictly obey the law of the conservation of energy; but what is called law is simply an expression of the direction along which form of energy acts, not the form of energy itself. He continued: "We may explain molecular and molar motions and discover all the physical laws of motion, but we shall be as far as ever from the solution of the vastly more important question as to what force of will and intellect is behind the motion of molecules, guiding and constraining them in definite directions along predetermined paths."¹ All thinkers, from Anaxagoras, Sir Isaac Newton, Hegel, and More, to Professor W. Crookes himself, have believed in mind as the efficient or emanative cause—the *nous demiourgos* of Greek kosmical speculation. But though all say that it is, no one, not even Professor Crookes, says what it is.

The *Times* concluded its article by a challenge, "Suppose Mr. Crookes, before explaining the facts of telepathy, makes it perfectly clear to us all that they exist?" There seems no indication in the medical and scientific world to throw doubt on the extremely provisional and tentative hypothesis of Mr. Crookes in the *Lancet*. "Fairy tales of telepathy" are even current about distinguished lawyers, as, for instance, the one related about Mr. Benjamin in the *Still Life of the Middle Temple*. Why should this be a subject on which one should "wed with doubt in Plato's shade?"

Dr. Johnson, since he lived in an age before the discovery of rays, either X rays or cathodic, certainly cannot be accused of serving the occasion in having allowed Boswell to relate of him that he believed more or less in second sight. And it is more significant that Johnson told Boswell that second sight, whatever it was, was not a fortuitous phenomenon, thus hinting at the possibility of a scientific solution of the subject. The *Times* says that Professor W. Crookes offers explanations. No one ever refuted ghost stories more circumstantially than Dr. Johnson. But if, living in the age that he did, the "harmless drudge," who undoubtedly possessed some of the rays of genius, could keep an open mind as to the more mysterious of psychical phenomena, we, who live in the age of the Roentgen ray, have not got the excuse for "wedding with doubt in Plato's shade" that the lexicographer had. The path of science trends to the goal of certainty, and the rampart of doubt that the past furnishes us with is almost overthrown. As Shelley once wrote, "the whole web of human things," even birth and the grave, "are not as they were."

N. W. SIBLEY.

¹ *The Lancet*, Art.: "Psychical Research and the Roentgen and other X Rays," Feb. 6, 1897, p. 391.

CHEAP AND GOOD MONEY.

IT is as clear as day that if ever Free Trade has to get fair play we must have Free Banking and an unfettered currency to carry on trade and commerce with. The Bank of England is a great monopolist establishment. It was founded with the exclusive privilege of being the only bank of note issue in London and for sixty-five miles around the city; it still keeps other banks of issue outside. Sir Robert Peel's Bank Act of 1844 gave a further control over other banks, by preventing the country banks from increasing their issue of notes and not allowing new banks to issue notes at all. For what good is all that favour granted to the Bank? Certainly it is not for any public good, or for any benefit to other banks or to the merchants of the country.

Manifestly it would be for the benefit of all the banks in England to have liberty to issue bank notes of their own, as it would yield them a profit of as much per cent. on their note issues as the rate charged for discounts and advances; besides that, they would be saved the expense of keeping their "till money" in gold coin, as their own bank notes would serve as reserve, and save the expense of keeping so much gold to trouble us. It was contrary to the sound principles of Adam Smith, Mr. Pitt and other skilled political economists to pass the statute of 1816, which for the first time enacted that the piece of gold now called "a sovereign" should be the standard of value for the "legal pound." Before that time the Bank of England notes were "legal money" and the bank notes of the Scottish banks passed current for the regular currency of the country. It should always be borne in mind that the Corn Laws and the Currency Contraction Acts were all passed by the same Parliament in 1816, after the Tory party got their full swing and made laws to raise the rents of the landlords and the interests of the fundholders, at the same time taking the taxes from off the landlords and laying them on the poor people. The Money Laws and the Corn Laws are all of the same class; therefore, when the Corn Laws were repealed, Peel's Currency Restriction Acts and Bank Acts should have been repealed also; then Free Trade would have had fair play, which it has not had. It is very shortsighted of some members of the Cobden Club not to see that the Bank Restriction Acts are as bad as the Corn Laws were. They should know that gold is a *commodity* that ought to be left to find its own level of

value in the markets like other commodities, and until this is done foreigners can come and take advantage of us in exchange, to our looking face, by taking away our gold at our fixed price and importing it into their own country duty free, where it will be worth more than we sell it at; whereas they refuse to take our goods in exchange for their produce, except at an almost prohibitive duty of 50 per cent. *ad valorem* or so. This imposture would be prevented and free trade made *imperative* if Britain would put *gold bullion* in the same category as silver, and let it rise or fall in price. Monometallists may go to Klondyke—Bimetallists are out of the running. The soundest and most serviceable money for the British Empire would be British Treasury notes authorised by Parliament in suitable denominations.

In addition to National Treasury notes there should be some provision made for the issue of their own notes by the banks throughout the three kingdoms. These notes would have to be payable on demand in Treasury notes, and would be secured by the lodgment of Consols with the Treasury for the amount of the circulation. These bank notes would be a very great advantage to banks, as they would enable them to lend out money to their customers, discount bills and give ample accommodation to all trades and industries as they might see proper. Thus every trustworthy party would be likely to receive bank assistance to a reasonable extent on sufficient securities at fair rates, without having to resort to the extortionary money-lenders who are always on the hunt to prey on unwary borrowers. The establishment of a greater number of good banks in the different towns and localities of this country would give an immense impetus to agriculture, trade and general employment. There is no fear of "over-production" until people get too much of everything they need, or until people have no further desires to strive to obtain. This country might be far more densely populated still, if more manufactories were got up to employ the idle hands in the land, and make clothing and other articles of utility to the many millions of people who are in want in other lands. Let us therefore encourage trade by all means, and in the first place by the improvement of our monetary system.

It was a great and most serviceable improvement which the bankers made when they commenced to issue *bank-notes* for money, in place of the precious metals, as paper money is more economical, and when issued by reliable banks in civilised countries is now generally preferred. There is however one singular exception, which may be accounted for by the fact that our Government has been so conservative of old establishments that the Bank of England still survives, and is opposed to the use of paper notes for less than five pounds in England. That handicaps our home trade and curtails the business of bankers and others to a miserly minimum.

It has often been pointed out that the Bank of England started its business as a monopolist establishment; but the Bank of Scotland, which was started only two years later by the same Mr. Paterson, was founded on free trade principles. The Scottish landed gentry and the upper classes took deep interest in their banks: they made it evident that their banks were meant to serve the public in the first place, for these banks in their early days gave good interest for deposits and were quite content with moderate dividends. It was not long after the Scotch banks were started that they began to issue their own notes, and by that means they were enabled to give good accommodation to their customers, more than they could have done if they had been confined to use coin only. The one-pound Scotch bank notes made fortunes for the Scotch people.

The Scotch banks with their free issues of notes prospered, and the Scottish people were always proud of their banks; but influential English statesmen expressed their ill-will against Scotland having the privilege of issuing one-pound notes while they had not the same liberty. In order to alter this, Sir Robert Peel in 1825 proposed to stop the privilege of issuing one-pound bank notes in Scotland; but that proposal raised such a storm in Scotland, and caused the writing of the celebrated *Letters on the Currency* by Sir Walter Scott, that Sir Robert was forced to give up his idea at that time. But he returned to the attack in 1844 and 1845, and got his Bank Acts passed, which riveted the fetters firmer on the issue of notes in England. The English bank note circulation is now reduced to a shadow of what it used to be; so much the worse for the English public, for the more ready money that is put into circulation so much the more trade is done for cash; therefore, it is good policy to allow the circulating medium to increase as required—and the best way to do this is to allow all banks to issue what notes they require, when secured and authorised. Thus the several banks could extend their business as they thought proper to all their customers on free-trade principles with wholesome competition. It is to this the business of banking must now come, in order to let all businesses, trades and industries have all the advantages which the wealth and resources of England can so well afford. This is how we have the advantage over poorer nations if we keep our monetary matters right. There is plenty of capital here.

In support of this proposed reform and expansion of our banking and currency system, refer to the returns and balance-sheets of the banks as published in the *Economist* and other financial papers, and it will be seen that there is an enormous amount of money lying idle as "reserves" in the large banks. There is no doubt a great deal more *dead* stock of capital there than is at all necessary, because, besides cash on hand, there is the shareholders' "reserved liability" to look to in case of need. So that most of the banks could sail

far closer to the wind than they do. If more safety is required, several banks might associate together to support each other in case of "a run." Banks should spread their wings rather than draw in.

The Scottish banks, combined and united into a sort of trade union, after Peel's Bank Act of 1845 was passed. It gave the existing banks an authorised issue of notes, but shut out any new bank from that privilege—since then the Scottish banks have behaved rather selfishly to the commercial and industrial classes. They used to allow about 3 per cent. interest for deposits before 1845, and never charged over 5 per cent. for cash credits, discounts, or advances. Now the allowance for current-account credits is reduced to *nil*, and the charges for loans and advances are even higher than London rates, while the Scottish banks send a lot of their Scotch money to invest in London at lower rates than they will lend to their own customers at home—even to accommodate the people the money belongs to! Is that fair and honourable? The annual statement of the ten Scotch banks just published shows the capital to be £9,302,000, reserve £6,640,000. The reserve of profits now amounts to $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the capital. The deposits are £96,295,000, the note circulation £7,552,000. The amount lent out to the public in Scotland appears to be actually less than half of the amount of their deposits. This shows that the Scottish banks are not so accommodating to their friends *at home* as they should be, but they say "there is no demand for more money in Scotland." Bosh! If the Government will extend the privilege of note issues to new banks so as to bring new banks into fair competition with the old banks, the people of Scotland would soon let all the banks see that all their money might be used to good purpose in various remunerative industries and public works at home. What is now required for Scotland is to repeal Peel's Bank Act of 1845 and let banking be as free in Scotland as it was before that. Ireland should also get the same privileges of free banking, and England would be greatly benefited by adopting the same system of free banking, together with cheap and good money, which is the life of trade, and good trade is the life and strength of the nation.

ROBERT EWEN.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

Twelve Years in a Monastery,¹ by Joseph McCabe, is another religious autobiography, but of a very different type to Mr. Trevor's. Indeed the two books necessarily present a striking contrast, the one emanating from the extreme of English Dissent, the other describing the actual experiences of one brought up in the strictest orthodoxy of Rome. Mr. McCabe is a writer of unusual ability and marked moderation, and though his judgments upon the system of which he was a victim are severe, his criticisms are never marked by the extravagance which disfigures the writings of so many anti-Romanists. *Twelve Years in a Monastery* is the best book we have read on the way in which priests are made since the publication of A. De Sylvia's *Séminaires et Séminaristes* about five years ago. Mr. McCabe's summary of the ethical value of modern monasticism is so impartial and obviously just that we cannot refrain from quoting a few sentences: "The idyllic life of the monk, a life of prayer and toil, and unworldliness or other-worldliness, does not exist to any great extent outside the pages of Catholic apologists and a few non-Catholic poets. The forms of monasticism remain, but the spirit has almost departed from them. One is forcibly reminded of that passage of Carlyle where he speaks of institutions as fair masks under which, instead of fair faces, one catches a glimpse of shuddering corruption. Not that monasticism, judged apart from its profession, is an object of special moral reprobation; its fault, its title to contempt, lies rather in its continued profession of an ideal from which it has hopelessly fallen, and in its constant effort to hide that discrepancy."

Those good people who are alarmed at the alleged progress of Romanism in England may find a good deal to relieve their fears in Mr. McCabe's pages, for he shows conclusively that there is no real progress, and that large numbers of Catholics are so only in name. We congratulate Mr. McCabe on having had the moral courage publicly to withdraw from a system in which he had lost faith, and we congratulate him also upon the moderation with

¹ *Twelve Years in a Monastery*. By Joseph McCabe (lately Father Antony, O.S.F.). London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1897.

which he condemns it. The details of the education and life of an English monk are full of interest and the book deserves to be widely read.

A third work of a religious and biographical character is the *Life and Letters of William John Butler*, late Dean of Lincoln and sometime vicar of Wantage.¹ The title-page bears no author's name, but we are given to understand the book is produced by a member of the late Dean's family, and it consists largely of material contributed by his friends and co-workers in the Church to which he was so devoted. Dean Butler was a Churchman before everything, and though a High Churchman of the Pusey-Oxford school, had very little sympathy with some of the more extravagant developments of modern "ritualism." The book is of interest as giving an account of the life of a follower rather than a leader in one of the great religious movements of this century. Butler's earnestness was uncompromising and even severe, but the impression left upon us by a perusal of his life is not one of unmixed admiration. Whether it was worth while to be so much in earnest about the multiplication of Church services and the inculcation of Church dogmas in the minds of children and working people seems to us open to doubt, but we have no doubt about his sincerity. No more faithful picture of the life a hard-working clergyman has been presented, and it may be read with interest even by those who, like ourselves, are unable to sympathise with his aims.

The appreciation of the late Dean Church's *Village Sermons*² by the religious reading public is evidenced by the issue of a third series of them. The present selection is marked by the same ability earnestness, and simplicity that we have noted in the previous ones; and though naturally the doctrines of the Church usually fill a prominent place in the discourses, occasionally the preacher rises to a loftier height, as in a sermon on "The Greatness of Charity," which people of every denomination or of no denomination could read with pleasure.

We have received from Messrs. Macmillan & Co. Vols. III. and IV. of the Eversley edition of the *Holy Bible*, edited by Mr. J. W. Mackail. We have already expressed our approval of this most convenient edition of the Bible; and the advantage of its publication in separate volumes is very distinctly seen in those before us. Vol. III. contains the historical books from I. Kings to Esther; and Vol. IV. the "writings" from Job to Solomon's Song. Each volume, therefore, has a unity of its own.

¹ *Life and Letters of William John Butler*, late Dean of Lincoln, &c. With Portraits. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1897.

² *Village Sermons*. Preached at Whately by the late R. W. Church, M.A., D.C.L. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1897.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

IN his *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*¹ Herr Karl Kautsky shows a thorough knowledge of this particular study, together with a keen critical insight of the general religious, social, and political movements of the period. The keynote to all these movements, as the author is careful to point out in the Introduction, is the financial tyranny of the Papacy. Its dominance he aptly compares with *La Haute Finance* or the Stock Exchange of modern times. Its jurisdiction, however, was quite as much disputed as that of the latter at the present time. "Both have in common," writes Herr Kautsky, "the faculty of exciting the enmity of all other ranks of society—not only of the exploited classes, but also of the exploiters. Both are compelled to relinquish much of their spoils to the greatest of all exploiters, and both view the treasures of the latter with eager, covetous eyes. Nothing is more erroneous than the opinion that the obedience shown to the Papal power during the second half of the Middle Ages was either hearty or stupid. It was neither. It might rather be designated as a sullen submission, always resentful and rebellious whenever chance offered. But so long as the foundations of a new order of society and government were non-existent the Papacy was quite as impregnable as *La Haute Finance* has hitherto proved itself to be."

Although these movements from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries to the era of the Reformation were to some extent religious, and based upon a sincere desire to return to primitive Christianity, they were less religious than social or political. It is true that they appeared more or less effectually concealed by the veil of religion. All parties fought under some religious banner, so to speak, or another. When the proletariat joined forces with the wealthy classes, what appeared as religious heresy was in reality political. And when the proletariat had become communistic and attempted to assail the existing order of society, all the vested interests were united against it, and the collapse of these heretical communistic movements was, as a rule, sudden and inevitable, apparently leaving no trace behind it. The distinguishing mark of heretical communism, as compared with early Christian communism, was its revolutionary spirit, and its chief point of resemblance to the latter and to modern communism is its internationalism. It was in Bohemia that heretical communism found its first opportunity of clearly differentiating itself from the other heretical sects, and accordingly Herr Kautsky devotes his first chapter to the history of

¹ *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*. By Karl Kautsky, editor of *Die Neue Zeit*, author of *The Growth of Population and Social Progress, from Plato to the Anabaptists*, &c. Translated by J. L. and E. G. Mulliken. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1897.

the Taborites. This is followed by an account of their successors, the Bohemian Brethren, and here Herr Kantsky takes the opportunity of making an able defence of that much-maligned reformer Thomas Münzer, and of showing up Luther and Melanchthon in anything but a favourable light. The last chapter, forming half of the book, deals at length with the Anabaptists.

We can only describe this treatise as a brilliant success. The research must have been enormous and most difficult. It is not a ponderous volume of painfully piled-up facts, but a clear, thoughtful, tolerant survey of events and movements obscured by the clouds of class prejudice and religious bigotry of centuries. A word of praise must be accorded to the translators for their admirably free translation.

Rapara, or The Rights of the Individual in the State,¹ by Mr. Archibald Forsyth, is a most remarkable book. Rapara consists of one large island, called Rapara, and three small islands, with a total area of 6370 square miles, situated some 200 miles south of Austral Island in the South Pacific. The native inhabitants are Maoris of the Polynesian race, and the island is sometimes marked on the map Davis Island, after a supposed discovery by an officer of that name in 1686. It was visited by Admiral Roggeveen in 1722, and by Captain Cook in 1744.

Up to 1840 the island was visited chiefly by whalers, and in this year, after an agreement with the natives, a permanent settlement was arranged, and in the following year Captain Black, of the whaling barque *Ranger*, arrived with the first contingent of colonists and their stores. He was quickly followed by others, and so rapidly did the colony grow that it was soon necessary to provide a constitution and an executive government. With the social, economic, and political growth of the new State this book is concerned. Two parties were formed from the start, Radical and Conservative, the former pursuing a policy which Mr. Forsyth labels as equalistic individualism, and the latter maintaining the old-world views of land monopoly, taxation, &c., dubbed by the author as monopolistic individualism. The basis of equalistic individualism, according to Mr. Forsyth, is "that all material wealth and gifts of Nature belong to the community, and should therefore be treated so as to bestow the greatest benefits on its individual members; and that all produced wealth belongs to the individuals that produced it, and should therefore be their exclusive property." Just as Mr. Forsyth is opposed to monopolistic individualism because it grants private property in land with its stores of natural wealth, so is he opposed to communistic collectivism because it claims produced wealth as the common property of the community.

¹ *Rapara; or, The Rights of the Individual in the State.* By Archibald Forsyth. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1897.

The whole story reads like a Utopian romance. By 1884 Rapara had obtained such a full measure of equitable laws and institutions that no demands were made for new measures. These laws produced neither great individual riches nor correlative poverty. Poverty, of course, there was, but only the poverty inseparable from indolence, extravagance, or misfortune. In the last chapters Mr. Forsyth considers to what extent these laws are calculated to ameliorate the "submerged tenth" in other countries, more particularly in England and Australia.

The extremes of riches and poverty in the United Kingdom, and particularly in London, are, he declares, nothing less than a national disgrace; but, he adds, "the strong Conservative instinct to let things remain as they are prevents any remedial measures from being applied to the seat of the evil."

"In this position we would expect that the working classes would join hands with Liberals to have bad laws replaced by good ones; but so far from this being the case, we find them either supporting Conservative action, thwarting Liberal measures, or advocating wild and visionary measures of reform."

Whether the history of Rapara is ideal or not, this book appeals most strongly to every intelligent working man and to every student of sociology.

Messrs. Bellot's and Willis's useful and interesting book on *The Laws Relating to Unconscionable Bargains with Money-Lenders*¹ has made its appearance at a most opportune moment. Public opinion has in recent years been strongly attracted to the question of the expediency of reimposing some check upon the operations of the money-lending fraternity by the facts, which actions in the county courts are constantly bringing to light, as to the astounding bargains which the improvident and needy are willing to make. The Royal Commission recently appointed to consider the whole question of usury is at present in the midst of its labours, and will, no doubt, in the course of the year, report as to the advisability of some alteration in the existing law. Under the circumstances, the eminently practical suggestions—as they appear to us—of the learned authors, as to the limits within which the exaction of interest might be confined, may well be commended to the attention of those who will ultimately have to deal with the matter. The opening chapters are occupied with a very interesting account of the origin of usury and its growth among the peoples of the ancient world, and of the laws by which the taking of interest was regulated in the early history of this country. Then follows a clear and careful

¹ *The Law Relating to Unconscionable Bargains with Money-Lenders*. Including the History of Usury to the Repeal of the Usury Laws. With Appendices containing a Digest of Cases, annotated, relating to Unconscionable Bargains, Statutes, and Forms for the use of Practitioners. By Hugh H. L. Bellot, M.A., B.C.L., and R. James Willis, Barristers-at-Law. London: Stevens & Haynes. 1897.

statement of the principles upon which the Courts proceed at the present day in giving relief to heirs, reversioners, and others, against unconscionable bargains. A digest of important cases, an appendix of the forms required in actions of this description, and a copious index, add most materially to the value of the work from a practitioner's point of view. The book is well written and well informed, and we can with confidence recommend it to all those who are interested in a question which intimately concerns the social welfare of a large section of the population of this country.

VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

With the Conquering Turk, Confessions of a Bashi-Bazouk,¹ by Mr. G. W. Steevens, contains a vivid description of the late Turko-Greek War from the Turkish point of view. Mr. Steevens, however, was not, like Mr. Vizetelly, whose *Reminiscences* we noticed last month, a genuine Bashi-Bazouk, as the title might lead us to suppose, but a real war correspondent from start to finish. He was, however, a strong Turkophile, and just as Mr. Vizetelly hated the Russians, so Mr. Steevens loathed the Greeks. According to him, all Greeks are cowards or rascals, and sometimes both. And from his point of view Mr. Steevens would appear to be right, for the Greeks were always running away, and those who remained in the captured towns and villages, hourly expecting the massacres of Ellassona, would naturally not appear at their best. The war, as a war, was a farce. "It was," says Mr. Steevens, "a war of hyperbole—a page of '*Tartarin de Tarascon*.'" The Greeks retreated without a struggle from impregnable positions, and the Turks, who might have turned the retreat into an annihilation of the Greek army, sat down and looked at their beards for days together. Mr. Steevens is full of praise for the Turk rank and file, but for the officers he has the highest contempt. They are either incapable or cowards. But all this we knew before. Mr. Steevens is perplexed at the dilatory movements of Edhem Pasha, and puts down the extraordinary movements in the rear to the incapacity and cowardice of the Greek leaders. We should not be in the least surprised if the real solution is that suggested in a recent number of *Truth*. Russia is the only Power which has gained anything by the war, and if the Sultan and King George have been but puppets pulled by Russian strings, this would explain the extraordinary tactics of both sides, although it does not excuse the undoubted corruption, ineptitude,

¹ *With the Conquering Turk. Confessions of a Bashi-Bazouk.* By G. W. Steevens, author of *The Land of the Dollar*, &c. With Four Maps. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons. 1897.

and cowardice of the Greek reigning House and its following of Greek aristocrats. However prejudiced Mr. Steevens may be, his accounts of what he actually saw do not seem to be in the least exaggerated. His description of scenes are bright and clear, and his delineations of character are lifelike and humorous. The interest is sustained throughout.

*From the Tropics to the North Sea,*¹ by Mrs. Fanny A. Barkly, consists of a number of slight sketches of the Seychelles Islands, the Falkland Islands, and Heligoland. If only Mrs. Barkly had had greater command of correct and idiomatic English, and had abstained from the relation of a number of petty incidents of travel of no interest to any one, save perhaps herself, we should have read this book with real pleasure. There is much that is interesting in these sketches of colonial life in places lying out of the beaten track where the author's husband was successively Governor, and we cannot help feeling that Mrs. Barkly could have done better if she had tried. From her description of Heligoland we feel more sorry than ever at Lord Salisbury's "graceful concession," but we find some consolation in Mrs. Barkly's statement that the sea is gradually and surely washing it away.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

MR. FREDERIC HARRISON'S biography of *William the Silent*,² in the Foreign Statesmen Series, is, in some respects, an admirable work. It presents William in the character of a hero struggling for civil and religious liberty. That he possessed fine qualities we must acknowledge; but we are inclined to think that Mr. Harrison exaggerates the cruelty of the Spaniards. In the struggle against Alva, the Dutch themselves perpetrated many acts of cruelty. William, moreover, was not an ideal character. He was weak in his dealings with his wife, Anne of Saxony, and even his personal courage has been questioned.

The life of a great surgeon has a human interest of its own which certain faddists fail to realise. The biography of *John Hunter*,³ published by Mr. Fisher Unwin, will repay perusal. It shows that a man devoted to the great and useful art of surgery may be also

¹ *From the Tropics to the North Sea*. Including Sketches of Colonial Life; Five Years in the Seychelles, Gordon's Garden of Eden: with an Interlude on the Falklands in the South Pacific; followed by Promotion to Heligoland, the Gem of the North Sea. By Fanny A. Barkly (author of *Among Boers and Bushos*, &c.). Westminster: The Roxburghe Press.

² *William the Silent*. By Frederic Harrison. London: Macmillan & Co.

³ *Masters of Medicine: John Hunter*. By Stephen Paget. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

a humorist and a practical philanthropist. Hunter in some respects bears a resemblance to Darwin. He never trusted to mere speculation in his researches. He verified everything before drawing any conclusion. He was by birth a Scotchman, and a friend of Smollett. He did, perhaps, more than any other man of his time for the progress of surgery.

Although the authenticity of *Robert Drury's Journal*,¹ describing his voyage to Madagascar, and his life there as a slave for fifteen years, is more than doubtful, the book must be accepted as a biographical narrative, for there can be no question as to the existence of Drury. It is not improbable that Daniel Defoe, who lived at the same period, had some hand in this production. The style is inferior to that of *Robinson Crusoe*, yet in some respects it closely resembles it. The book is very curious and interesting.

In the volume entitled *Eighteenth Century Letters*,² tardy justice is done to the character of Swift. Too long has Swift's intellect been praised by persons who have not discovered the goodness of his heart. Mr. Stanley Lane Poole, in his excellent introduction, shows how we find the true Swift in the letters written to his intimate friends. The picture, not only Swift himself, but also of Addison and Steele, presented by the letters in this volume, will be found most invaluable.

The *Life of Dr. Dykes*³ is interesting as a literary portrait of a clergyman, who was also a talented musician. Much of the book deals with Dr. Dykes's literary work and hymns. Some of the letters on religious topics possess interest for a few.

It would be hard to find any book on a partly historical, partly archæological subject, more interesting than Mr. Ernest Law's *Short History of Hampton Court*.⁴ We have in this volume a vivid account of the sumptuous life led in Hampton Court by Cardinal Wolsey, the domestic existence there of Henry VIII. and his various wives, the associations of Mary Tudor and Elizabeth with the grand old place, and then its use by James I., Charles I., Cromwell, Charles II., James II., William of Orange, Queen Anne, and the four Georges. The book is at once gossipy and accurate. It can be read with pleasure from cover to cover.

We may deal with Mr. Percy G. Sheppard's little book on *The Principles of Geology as deduced from a study of the Sedimentary Formations in South Africa*⁵ rather as a historical inquiry than a

¹ *Madagascar; or, Robert Drury's Journal, during Fifteen Years' Captivity on the Island.* And a Further Description of Madagascar by the Abbé Alexis Rochon, Edited by Captain Pasfield Oliver, R.A. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

² *Eighteenth Century Letters.* Edited by R. Brimley Johnson. (Swift, Addison, Steele.) With an Introduction by Stanley Lane Poole. London: Innes & Co.

³ *Life of Dr. Dykes.* Edited by the Rev. J. T. Fowler. London: John Murray.

⁴ *A Short History of Hampton Court.* By Ernest Law, B.A., Barrister-at-Law. London: George Bell & Sons.

⁵ *The Principles of Geology as deduced from a Study of the Sedimentary Formations in South Africa.* By Percy G. Sheppard. London: Mackay. (For Private Circulation.)

scientific treatise. The view embodied in these pages as to the origin of coal, though contrary to orthodox belief, has in it a certain amount of plausibility. Mr. Sheppard does not accept the theory that coal has an organic origin, and considers that nature liberated carbon from its chemical combination in the sea and deposited it on the bottom at stated intervals. He bases his conclusions on a close study of the South African coalbeds.

The story of *Lord Cochrane's Trial before Lord Ellenborough*¹ for conspiracy, in conjunction with one De Berenger, otherwise "Colonel Du Bourg," and others, to create a rise in the funds by circulating false rumours as to the death of Napoleon Bonaparte, is elaborately told in a volume of 500 pages by Mr. J. B. Atlay, a member of the English Bar. This celebrated case has excited very great attention, and, as rather severe charges were made against the judge who tried the case—apparently without good reason—the publication of this volume is perfectly justifiable. On the other hand, Lord Cochrane, if he were innocent, suffered terrible consequences from his conviction. He was heavily fined, condemned to stand in the pillory, and expelled from Parliament, of which he was a member. Mr. Atlay has brought out the points favourable to Lord Ellenborough very ably; but we must refrain from pronouncing a dogmatic opinion on a question which, after all, is one that should be submitted to legal minds rather than to the lay public.

Mr. George Hooper's admirable work, *The Campaign of Sedan*,² is already well known and appreciated. The new and cheaper edition of it, published by Messrs. George Bell & Sons, will be acceptable to the general reader. The narrative is perhaps slightly unfair to the French, as it is mainly based on the history of the war of 1870-71 prepared by the German staff. But the French accounts are wanting in precision, and the course taken by the author was unavoidable. The plans given of the battles of Woerth and Sedan are very useful for the purpose of reference.

The fourth volume of the splendid work entitled *The British Empire in the Nineteenth Century*³ has just been published by Messrs. Blackie and Son. The volume, which is illustrated by engravings and maps, deals with the progress of archaeological, astronomical, and geological research, as well as with the literature of the early portion of this century. The volume also deals with the history of British India, and with Burma, Ceylon, Borneo, and Hong Kong. The facts have evidently been collected with the utmost care.

¹ *The Trial of Lord Cochrane before Lord Ellenborough*. By J. B. Atlay, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. London: Smith, Elder & Co.

² *Sedan, the Downfall of the Second Empire*. By George Hooper. London: George Bell & Sons.

³ *The British Empire in the Nineteenth Century*. By Edgar Sanderson, M.A. Vol. iv. London: Blackie & Son.

MEDICAL.

AN American manual of surgery combining the teaching of the New York and Philadelphian schools should present the subject in a broad, not to say cosmopolitan, aspect, so as to make the work as useful on this side the Atlantic as on the other. This somewhat difficult task has been accomplished by Drs. Wharton and Curtis¹ in a bulky volume profusely illustrated, which does credit to authors and publishers. To do justice to this work it is necessary to bear in mind the object aimed at, which is entirely practical. The enormous extension of the field of surgery of late renders it year by year more difficult to present within a reasonable compass the accepted facts and theories on which the art is based. Condensation must therefore be carried to the extreme limit, and this involves the further necessity of bestowing the greatest care on preserving the relative importance of the several parts. The authors describe the injuries and diseases which fall to the surgical branch of the profession with a view to render their recognition feasible, and give fairly full directions for the management of those cases which are usually attended by general practitioners. As to the more difficult conditions, when experts should be called in if possible, a slighter sketch of the modes of treatment is given. The etiology and pathology of surgical affections are only stated in such outline as to refresh the reader's memory and make the clinical descriptions more definite.

From what has been stated it will be seen how pressing has been the need of condensation -- a need which quite excludes historical and bibliographical dissertations as well as argumentative statements of opposing theories. On unsettled questions the authors give the decision at which they have jointly arrived, and as a rule a very safe decision it is. With what judicial fairness they have dealt with their subject may be seen from the manner in which they have refrained from claiming credit for their own country. As an example of this the introduction of intubation as a substitute for tracheotomy is so largely the result of American energy that we might have excused a reference to the fact, but Dr. O'Dwyer's name is not even mentioned, and the summing up of the indications for the two operations might well have been written by one of our elder English laryngologists. Again, the surgery of the intestines has advanced with giant strides in recent years, and to American surgeons a very large share of the credit is due, especially in reference to the appendix vermiformis. Here, as elsewhere, however, accepted facts are stated in a clear and precise manner, the newest in just such terms as the most ancient. All through the volume

¹ *The Practice of Surgery. A Treatise on Surgery for the use of Practitioners and Students.* By Henry R. Wharton, M.D., and R. Farquhar Curtis, M.D. London and Philadelphia: Lippincott. 1898.

the same mode of practical teaching prevails: plain directions are given in unmistakable terms. At times this gives an almost authoritative tone to the statements, as if the authors were instructing their classes. This is well for students and will not be resented by young practitioners. The work is designed for such, and those who desire full discussions of different theories should turn to cyclopædias or monographs.

The chapter on the eye is written by Dr. G. E. de Schweinitz, whose essay is as complete as it could be possible in the thirty-five pages allotted to this subject. Indeed it would almost appear that this specialty and that of the ear can scarcely be done justice to in a work on general surgery; both have become so extensive as to demand treatises rather than chapters.

The new science of Bacteriology bulks so largely in the advance scientific surgery that the authors have done well to start with an epitome of that subject to serve as a foundation on which they may build in later chapters. A very brief description of those bacteria which play the most important part from a surgical point of view is given, and illustrated by two well-executed coloured plates, drawn—as are also the histological subjects—by Dr. F. G. Wood. Other microbes are considered in the sections devoted to the diseases to which they give rise.

It is gratifying to notice that out of more than 900 illustrations a large proportion are original. Of the very few misprints one on page 2 refers to Plate II. It should be Plate I.; but as the several figures are duly named on the plate, the error will not embarrass the reader more than a few seconds.

ORNITHOLOGY.

ORNITHOLOGY is so popular a branch of natural history that a reliable book on the subject ought to be very successful. Dr. W. T. Greene is a welcome guide to the management of birds in captivity, because his profound knowledge of their habits is derived from observation of them in their natural habitats as well as in aviaries. His *magnum opus* on the Parrot, with its beautiful engravings, is known to all who are interested in the subject. His recent *Feathered Friends*¹ is a pleasantly written account of some of the most engaging or these pets. He follows the classification of the Zoological Society, not because he approves of it, but for the convenience of his readers. That classification is very unsatisfactory, especially in the division of

¹ *Feathered Friends, Old and New.* By Dr. W. T. Greene, M.A., &c. London: L. Upcott Gill.

birds, and it would be a good thing if the society were to consult such an authority as Dr. Greene, instead of leaving the subject in the hands of mere amateurs. The "Zoo" is undoubtedly a popular resort, and there are many creatures there which are sure to be attractive to the visitors, but we cannot commend the management of the Gardens. Some of the animals are not properly dieted, and others are inappropriately or insufficiently fed—rather a discreditable fact for the Zoological Society of London.

Feathered Friends is nicely illustrated, and would serve as a gift-book to any admirer of birds, but it is sadly disfigured by some staring advertisements. We would not have said anything about the publisher's list, though that is printed in bad taste, overcrowded with black letters. We are sorry too to see that a publisher of Mr. Gill's standing should have had it printed abroad.

BELLES LETTRES.

THE interest taken in the literary labours of the late Matthew Arnold is not likely to die out while his influence as a teacher and an apostle of culture continues unimpaired. We find in the little volume entitled *Two Essays upon Matthew Arnold, with some of his Letters to the Author*,¹ by Mr. Arthur Galton, much broad-minded and able criticism. The language applied to Goldsmith is aptly used with regard to Arnold: "He laboured in almost every field of literature, and everything that he handled became fascinating and beautiful." Mr. Galton compares the poetry of Matthew Arnold with that of Wordsworth, and points out that while the latter poet found in Nature sympathy and joy, the other saw in her a stern and awe-inspiring teacher. We entirely agree with the remark that the great note of Matthew Arnold's writings, whether in prose or verse, is distinction. At the same time, we are inclined to think that Mr. Galton overrates the poems, which, however artistic, lack spontaneity and vigour. Some of the letters contained in the volume are very interesting. The allusion to Macaulay's "cocksureness" as a critic is very felicitous.

*Lord Dullborough*² is a very amusing book. The author, the Hon. Stuart Erskine, is, in his way, an original humourist. The account of his hero's school-life is highly diverting. But the book becomes slightly tedious in the closing pages. There are, moreover, evidences of carelessness in the composition of the work. We recommend, however, those who wish to while away a few dull

¹ *Two Essays upon Matthew Arnold, with some of his Letters to the Author.* By Arthur Galton. London: Elkin Matthews.

² *Lord Dullborough.* A Sketch. By the Hon. Stuart Erskine. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

moments to read *Lord Dullborough*. At a time when so many wretched books are printed it may fairly claim a share of public attention.

The story of *Flora MacDonald*¹ is so interesting that we wonder Scott did not weave it into a romance. It was left for Mr. J. Gordon Phillips to do it, and he has, as far as we can judge, adopted the author of *Waverley* as his model. The narrative is well connected, but we cannot say much for the literary merit of the work. Mr. Phillips has most of Scott's faults—his diffuseness, his cumbrousness, and his lack of pure artistic impulse—while he has none of Scott's virility. Much more could easily be made of the subject.

Mr. George Thorne, in a little volume entitled *Jots*,² has told the story of his theatrical life. It is a gossipy book, full of odds and ends of interesting information. There is a touch of vulgarity in the style. Mr. Thorne is too fond of such expressions as "larking," and "enough to make a cat laugh." Surely he might have avoided such unrefined language, at least when he took up his pen to write a book?

*Nurse Adelaide*³ is a story which, though it is not very well written, has many features of interest. When the author tries to write in a psychological vein he fails. The closing chapters, in which there is no attempt at fine writing, are the best.

Probably the book entitled *The Brand of Hell; or, Life in Babylon*,⁴ must be regarded as a work of fiction, or at least a religious allegory. The preachiness of the work detracts from its interest. The closing scene, with its destructive explosion, might have been made highly dramatic by a novelist of ability. But Mr. Fry scarcely attempts to emerge out of the domain of polemics into that of art.

Marcus Warwick, Atheist,⁵ is really a powerful novel. It is an attempt to show how an unbeliever, being led to commit an act which was technically murder, if not manslaughter, and, seeing afterwards his own child—as he imagined—punished for his crime, is brought to recognise a Providence which "shapes our ends." The plot, though overstrained, has much originality. The closing chapters are written with great vigour and intensity.

*A Higher Latin Reader*⁶ is a work which will be found generally useful by students. It is edited by Messrs. H. J. Maidment, M.A., and T. R. Mills, M.A. The bulk of the passages selected are taken from papers set at University examinations, and they are repre-

¹ *Flora MacDonald, the Maid of Skye*. A Romance of the '45. By J. Gordon Phillips. London: Digby, Long & Co.

² *Jots*. By George Thorne. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

³ *Nurse Adelaide*. By Belton Otterburn. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁴ *The Brand of Hell; or, Life in Babylon*. By H. W. Fry. With Introductory Letter by the Rev. William Fuller Gooch. London: George Stoneman.

⁵ *Marcus Warwick, Atheist*. By Alice M. Dale. London: Kegan Paul.

⁶ *A Higher Latin Reader*. Edited by H. J. Maidment, M.A. Oxon., and T. R. Mills, M.A. London: W. B. Clive.

sentative of the Latin of different periods ranging from Plautus to Pliny the Younger. The notes, though very short, are valuable.

*Meg Langholme*¹ is a most interesting story of a motherless little girl who lives with her father. It is the story of her life until her marriage with the one who has been almost a brother to her. The chapters on Dutch landscape reminds one very much of *Us*, when the gypsies carry off the two children.

The edition of *Debrett's Peerage, Baronetage, Knightage, and Companionage* for 1898,² has been enlarged to 1900 pages. It contains a detailed record of the year's obituary, and a new feature of the edition for 1898 is a list of the names and addresses of firms holding Royal Warrants of appointment to her Majesty and the Prince and Princess of Wales. This list will no doubt prove of considerable use to patrons of the volume, especially those resident in the country, and we highly recommend *Debrett's* to our readers.

ART.

THE soldier is a first result of the union of men in society. The policeman comes only after long centuries of progress. The use of armed force under the guidance of a chief, for offence and defence, is natural in war, which was the chronic ailment of the primitive community. The policeman supposes that the community, organised into a State, acknowledges as one of its prime duties the keeping of peace among the citizens themselves. It is the beginning of that progress which ends in the applying of the State's energies to justice—to the protection of individual liberties—as its chief aim and reason for existence.

The growth and development of the city of Paris has been a continuous lesson of experience in this kind of progress. Paris, as the late Professor Freeman remarked, is one of the two cities (the other being Rome) which has created the country of which it is the capital. The history of the police force of Paris, from the early watch to the present guardians of the peace, must give the annals of a consistent progress, uninterrupted by the spasms of political revolutions, in the habits of that public civility which is a large part of civilisation. M. Lépine, who has just finished his term as Prefect of the Paris Police, has carried through a design which is in conformity with his recognised labours in furthering the interests of the great body of the French State. It is a *History of the Corps of the Guardians of the Peace of the City of Paris*.³

The book has been entrusted to the care of one of the oldest and

¹ *Meg Langholme*. By Mrs. Molesworth. London: W. and R. Chambers.

² *Debrett's Peerage, Baronetage, and Companionage*. London: Dean & Son.

³ *Histoire du Corps des Gardiens de la Paix*. Paris: Firmin-Didot. 1896.

most artistic publishing houses in France. The richness of the material part is enhanced by the copious use of illustrations of historic as well as artistic interest. The text is the conscientious and complete work of MM. Alfred Rey and Louis Féron, *attachés au Secrétariat-Général* of the Prefecture of Police. The outcome of the labour of love is not only one of those books of which France has the secret, and which are in themselves a work of art, it is a veritable Golden Book of the police of Paris. In it their tasks, often thankless, for many centuries of stirring history are narrated.

While France is alive only to military glory, this body of citizens, whose training and service are far severer than that of the soldier, restrain, steadily and obscurely, the constant uprising in individuals of instincts more hostile to society than many armies. There is so little lustre attached to their name that they have never been popular—they have never entered into the people's imagination as the condition of all their civil wellbeing. It is the case to-day as in the past. Even now the French people are carried away, beyond every appeal to sober love of truth and justice, by their suspicious sensitiveness in regard to the supposed honour of their army. It is never so with them for the police that makes life possible in time of unbroken peace between nations. During the Commune, as during the students' riots of later years, the voice of the populace is always against the policeman. At best his work is tolerated ; it is not romantic, it has not even the melodrama which calls for popular sympathy.

By police is not meant that secret service of detectives which forms so great a part of the foreign idea of the French police. This is not included in the Golden Book—it forms a Government service, which is perhaps necessary, but has nothing to do with the Corps of the Guardians of the Peace. M. Lépine is known to have devoted much and profitable attention to these guardians of society, to their training and the proper look of their uniform, to everything that might impress the mind of the French people, which judges always through the eye's prejudice. Perhaps the greatest work he has done will prove to be this volume, which discloses the deeds of heroism, under daily dangers, and without the theatrical surroundings that aid to military heroism, of the Paris police.

The authors of this book are well aware of the step still to be made by the French people in its social evolution. It is still in the military period, when every heart beats high at the thought of the exaltation of the *Patrie*. The army, which in the present necessity of universal conscription is but a function of the entire nation, is at once a cause and an effect of a national temper which cannot be considered by the philosopher as consistent with the highest civilisation. It is a limited and a local temper, taken up with securing the pre-eminence of one's own group rather than the advance of all mankind.

It differs only in degree from the schoolboy's desire that his cricket club shall "beat." There is no doubt that this intense spirit of nationality, with all its limitations, has helped in the past to the survival of the fittest morally as well as physically, in the struggle for existence of the various races of men. So long as it prevails, nationality—*la Patrie*—and the army which defends it will also prevail in the popular mind over any abstract idea of justice among all men. In younger France, even under the leadership of minds like that of Professor Lavissee, this seems to be the one ideal of civic life still remaining. It is one of the worst crimes imputed to the Socialist thinkers that they subject the idea of patriotism to that of humanity. Yet the least dispassionate study of the human species with the scientific method which is applied to the study of other branches of natural history can lead to but one conclusion: Justice is before Patriotism—the policeman represents in civilisation a higher ideal than the soldier.

It is, of course, necessary to take into account the hereditary mental tendencies which form a part of each separate race of men quite as much as do their physical characteristics. A peculiarly significant testimony is cited by our authors, who are both men of the trade, from a newspaper commentary of the police reforms instituted by Napoleon III. This radical reform, which has persisted under the Republic, was based on an imitation of the London system.

"The elements which compose the Paris police have so far given too good results to allow of their suppression in the present reorganisation. If the London constable has chiefly a civil character, it is because he answers to the needs of a population which is distinguished by the *methodisme* of its habits. In France, an essentially military country, the agent of the municipal police must also take his character from the national spirit: the mode of recruiting the policemen casts its military halo round their corps, which is made up in great part of former sub-officers."

This concession to the military spirit of the French people, wise as it is and happy in its results, has not led to any great amount of popular sympathy with the individual members of the police. The era of good feeling for the "Bobby" is, perhaps, reserved for the Fourth Republic which the Socialist politicians are rather prematurely announcing. Meanwhile, it would seem the depths of Anarchism to the average inhabitant of Paris to suggest that the rights of the individual, which are protected by the police, are of paramount importance to any rights for which the community can mobilise its army. Without pretending to criticise the French point of view, it is possible to point out the social progress which still remains to be accomplished in the popular sentiment. Our authors prefer to quote the words of an observant man of letters :

"The crowd, then, is not aware that these policemen are for the most part former soldiers; that, before they can wear the uniform which produces on the popular mind the same effect as red upon a bull, they must show a record absolutely free from any judicial sentence; and that they are kept under an iron yoke, subjected to a discipline more rigorous than in any regiment.

"You find the policemen first at a fire, the rivals of the firemen. Every day the newspapers tell of the persons who have been saved by them; runaway horses have been mastered; mad dogs have been killed; there has been a dangerous chase of malefactors over the roofs; a policeman has plunged into the Seine to fish out some wretch trying to commit suicide. The public is so accustomed to reading of such acts of devotedness that no attention is paid to them. The world passes by indifferent, never thinking that the man who thus risks his life daily and hourly is the father of a family, and he heeds it not, because the honour of his uniform imposes on him the duty of saving the lives of others without thinking of his own or of those who belong to him!

"Often, as I come homeward through the night, I meet these policemen, walking two by two or by fours, going through their quarter of the city, unmoved by the biting cold, in the snow, or wet to the bone by the rain; philosophically tramping through the mud; giving information to the belated passer-by; following him with their eyes, and hastening to his aid at the first call for help. Sometimes the marauding band is numerous: what matters it to the policeman?—it is not for him to calculate with danger; his duty is there!

"For a moment, when the weather is too foul, the policeman stands back beneath a door, and sees from his place the windows opposite lighted up, dazzling with their radiance, while the echoes of music are wafted to him, and a supper fragrance seems borne on the air. He complains not of the inequality of his lot, which is the reason why he who watches over the security of others shivers with cold while those for whom he watches take their pleasure, drink, sing, and dance. Suddenly a cry resounds, troubling the silence of the night—Murder, help! The policeman rushes forward; he is surrounded, set upon; his life is in danger. What is all this noise which dares thus to trouble the sleep of the *bourgeois*? "It is nothing," some one says—"it is only a policeman trying to arrest some criminal."

It is a pity that the Anarchists, who hate the police equally with the property-holders whom it protects, should not think of this other inequality in our present society. Their own safety against the exasperated crowd may be due to these same agents of a hated authority. This new fact might lead them to suspect that there is a peaceful evolution still possible for society toward a more generous

humanity, in which there will be something beside the inevitable division of men into those who have and those who have not. But for this it would be necessary to persuade the *bourgeois* themselves that the policeman is more essential, more honourable, and represents a higher ideal in the community than the soldier.

If anything could do this, it would be the publication among the people of the special chapter of the book of the Paris police which is entitled by the authors the *Livre d'Or* of the Guardians of the Peace. The troublous time of the Paris Commune may be passed over; there were then so many reasons for the confusion which seized hold of the popular mind. In that time of collective insanity (senselessly caused and ruthlessly repressed) policeman, priest, and judge fell together. But the list of the individual victims of duty, from 1830 down, is altogether glorious. In lawless riots and in the distress of cholera, while arresting assassins or, as was the case of Policeman Charles Raulin in 1878, while seeking to destroy a mad cat, these protectors of society have given up their lives. Apart from its immense interest from the point of view of the history of civic institutions, the book which illustrates these heroic deeds of a profession that neither art nor letters frankly recognise as heroic is a monument of justice.

POETRY.

THE late Mr. John Mills was too modest to publish his poems during his own lifetime. His family have done justice to his memory by giving them to the world. The volume entitled *Vox Humana*¹ contains some really excellent verse. The dedicatory sonnet by his daughter pays a graceful tribute to one she devotedly loved and bears testimony to the attractiveness of his character and the nobleness of his mind. Mr. Mills was much influenced by some of his great contemporaries. The lines "To His Father" recall the style and even the mode of expression of Tennyson's "In Memoriam." For instance:

"In social storm or civic strife,
In murky roar of mart or mill,
Clear lights of mild but earnest will
Touched all the heaving crests of life."

"The First Snowdrop" is in the manner of Burns. It begins:

"O wee, white, winsome thing!
What meanest thou blossoming
Thus without rhyme or reason
Like one born out of season?"

The translations from Goethe, Heine, and Schiller are admirable, especially that of Heine's "Sonnets to his Mother" in the *Buch der Lieder*.

¹ *Vox Humana*. Poems. By John Mills. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

A volume of *Poetical Sermons*¹ may not appear to ordinary persons inviting. But there is much true poetry in the volume published with that title by G. P. Putnam's Sons. Mr. William E. Davenport is evidently an admirer of Whitman, and imitates his style. The lines headed "Repent" are very Whitmanish, and are worthy of the author of *Leaves of Grass*.

*The Lesbia of Catullus*² is the title of a very creditable translation of the amatory poems of perhaps the tenderest of Roman poets. Some of Mr. Tremenheere's translations of Catullus are very felicitous.

Mr. Vincent O'Sullivan is a poet, but the keynote of his poetry is weakness—we might add, effeminacy. The volume of verses entitled *The Houses of Sin*³ exhibits this lamentable weakness, this absence of virile strength, in a very prominent way. Every poem in the volume shows the author's desire to say something bizarre, resulting in a kind of impotent feebleness of utterance. We would strongly advise Mr. O'Sullivan to give up what Mr. Swinburne, in his odd fashion, calls "sensual caterwauling," and to cultivate manliness of thought and language.

The volume of verse entitled *Pencil Rhymes and Poetry*⁴ belongs to the namby-pamby order of literature. A schoolboy of ordinary versifying powers would do better work. It is hard to conceive why such books are published.

The narrative poem entitled *Rose: A Romance of 192-*⁵ shows much originality. The supernatural element gives a certain weird character to the work. Though it is not poetry of a high order, it has decided merit. The closing lines run thus:

"Mind doth all other force transcend,
Can melt the rock, can Nature bend,
Can, after death, how far ascend!
What pathless ways through æther wend!"

The Inner Light and other Poems,⁶ by Ellen H. Ebbs, cannot be pronounced sublime verse, though the poetess in this case certainly resembles Milton to the extent of writing in blank verse. In some of the sonnets and lyrics which follow the longer and more ambitious poem there is much fancy and delicacy of expression. Altogether the writer is not without a portion of what Tennyson calls "the great poetic heart."

*The Good Ship "Matthew"*⁷ is a ringing ballad poem dealing with a Bristol story. Mr. Macpherson has told it in a vigorous style.

¹ *Poetical Sermons*. By William E. Davenport. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

² *The Lesbia of Catullus*. Translated by E. Tremenheere. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

³ *The Houses of Sin*. By Vincent O'Sullivan. London: Leonard Smithers.

⁴ *Pencil Rhymes and Poetry*. By George Ashmore Roberts. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁵ *Rose: A Romance of 192-*. By Kay Jay. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

⁶ *The Inner Light and Other Poems*. By Ellen H. Ebbs. London: Digby, Long and Co.

⁷ *The Good Ship "Matthew."* By A. C. MacPherson. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CXLIX. No. 3.—MARCH 1898.

AMERICANISM AND "THE MONROE DOCTRINE."

THE careful observer of the world's politics at the present time can hardly have failed to note the change that of recent date has come over the views and aspirations of many of our Yankee cousins with regard to the foreign relations and policy of their democratic Republic.

One of the leading principles which, from the commencement of their national existence in 1776, had actuated their politicians, had been the doctrine of non-interference in disputes which might arise between European nations, or on that continent of which their own States formed a part, and of avoidance of outside possessions and entanglements which might lead to the need of any large naval or standing military forces—a necessity of the Old World which they rightly regarded as an evil, and as against their republican principles. On the other hand, they were very jealous of the idea of any interference by European Powers, and were mainly desirous of settling and consolidating their widely spread but thinly populated country without reference to foreign politics.

But time and the march of events seem to have altered or modified this wise original policy. The flood of emigration has poured over the United States; great tracts of land, formerly half empty, have become filled with inhabitants, who are to a large extent men of foreign birth and alien blood, and the Anglo-Saxon character of the nation has been greatly diluted by the infusion into it of the Irish and Teutonic element, with the natural result that, as the press of population began to be felt, immigrants travelled farther afield; new States were formed and admitted into the Union; and, as numbers and competition in life increased, longing eyes began to be cast, first

on the lands of neighbouring nations: the rich mines of Mexico; Alaska with its adjacent seal fisheries (soon afterwards purchased from Russia), and on the vast grain tracts of Canada; and more recently, going beyond America itself, the desires of many have been freely expressed in favour of obtaining the island of Cuba, and to add it and the Sandwich Isles to the territories of their Republic, thus contemplating a new departure from the principles of their founders, and at the same time (though unconsciously) weakening the force which might belong to that policy, so much cherished by the Yankee people, which forms the subject of the present article, and which was first formally enunciated by their early President, James Monroe.

But, before more directly considering this policy, let us see whether, or how, the political views and opinions of the citizens of the United States (whom I will call, for want of a better title, the Yankee nation) have been influenced by Americanisms, which by degrees have crept into both the speech and the habit of thought of the inhabitants of that portion of the North American continent.

It will be admitted that the names or titles by which those about us are accustomed to describe persons and things (even if wrong or incorrect in themselves) have a great influence in forming our first impressions or ideas. The ancient Greeks evidently were of this opinion when they named the "Furies" in propitiation or deprecation "Eumenides," the well-meaning gracious goddesses! and our traditional titles of *Good Queen Bess* and *Peter the Great* have formed many an opinion in the minds of those who may know little or nothing of the greatness and meanness mixed up in the characters of both these monarchs.

Again, the common title of "German Empire," used for the past score of years for Prussia and its satellites, although far from correct, containing as it does semi-independent kingdoms (*e.g.*, Saxony, Bavaria, the Grand Dukedom of Baden, &c. &c.), has undoubtedly exercised a considerable influence over the minds and ideas of men. It is said that "language is given us to *conceal* our thoughts," but it is more certain that a want of precision in its use tends to *confuse* them.

Among the many English words constantly used in a loose and inaccurate manner, the term "*American*" stands pre-eminent, not only because of the numerous peoples it affects, but also because of the erroneous opinions and habit of thought which the continued misuse of this word has engendered and encouraged among the politicians and people of the United States; a misuse which has had, as we shall see, one mischievous result at least, in the exaggerated pretensions and claim, recently reaching a climax, in the public enunciation as a quasi-national demand of the provincial "pious opinion" known by the name of "The Monroe Doctrine."

The English language seems fast becoming the dominant tongue of the world, although in Europe its use may not be much extending ; yet westward her course of empire takes its way, and over the main part of the Northern American continent, as well as on the continent of Australia, it is supreme, whilst throughout large portions of Asia, Africa, and Oceania it is recognised as the tongue of the imperial governing race. Therefore, we contend, it is a matter of more than a little importance that such an international speech should be kept as pure and accurate as possible, and that its words to express ideas and facts should everywhere have the same constant meaning. For the "Queen's English" is not alone the national inheritance of Britons, but is also a sacred treasure-house enshrining for the world a varied and noble literature, the commonwealth of all English-speaking races, who, whether in the old hemisphere or the new, must all have an interest in its being preserved from ambiguity and deterioration.

A living tongue, unlike a dead language, must have growth and energy, to permit new ideas and fresh discoveries to find adequate expression ; but whilst we welcome the expansion of our tongue, it seems needful at the present time to enter a caveat against the injury done to all English speakers and writers by the prostitution of its words and the rape of their proper meaning to serve the interest or tickle the vanity of any section of them.

The misappropriation of the adjective "American," and its divorce from its true and natural meaning by the use of the term in a partial and limited sense—applying it to describe *alone* the persons and things of the group of united or federated States in the northern continent, without including in the expression the other and larger areas, both north and south, which are of course equally American, but absolutely distinct from the Republic—has been going on for a long time unchecked, until such misuse has become chronic, and presents a notable case in point of both ambiguity and mischief arising from an habitual use in a restricted Yankee sense of this English word, an error which has lately crept even into official Federal documents, and, still more blamably, is not unfrequently found in our own British journals ; but it is an Americanism (or shall we call it New Englandism ?) which by its continued indulgence has contributed not a little to foster that exaggerated spirit of "Spread-eagleism" and anti-British feeling which of late has been so disagreeably noticeable in the United States Press.

Among the many admirable qualities of our cousins across the Atlantic, the quality of clever inventiveness stands high, and as a national characteristic (very probably inherited from the mother people) it is certainly more prominent than diffidence ! It seems, therefore, a strange thing that in the matter of finding or inventing a distinct and dignified title for their own nation, they should have

exhibited so great a lack of originality and *amour propre* ! It is evident that the title "American" belongs to them in common only with other nations—Mexicans, Peruvians, Brazilians, and more especially to Canadians, and to Britons, our fellow-citizens in British America both North and South.

It is true that the various States of the Republican Union are in many respects quite independent, not to say disunited, and the citizens have their own provincial titles, as Virginians, Pennsylvanians, or New Yorkers, in the same way as we speak of Yorkshiremen, Devonians, or men of Kent ; but whilst these our fellow-citizens all rejoice in the common title of Englishmen, the Stateslanders, curiously enough, have adopted no correct mutual cognomen, and have no accurate and universally recognised name for their common nation ! From this singular lack of a proper name much misunderstanding has already arisen, and more is likely to arise from the cool attempt to appropriate exclusively to the citizens of the United States the name and title of "American" belonging equally to so many others. It is as if Spain, France, or Germany should contend that the title European must exclusively apply to their own particular nation, even though it were of smaller area and later age—a contentious pretension which will not, of course, be acquiesced in by British Americans, and which reminds one of the declaration of a certain Yankee tourist we once met at a Swiss hotel, who with peculiarly American modesty described himself (nasally) as speaking the "'Merikan language" ! The sense of humour is strong with "Uncle Sam," and he can hardly fail to see the absurdity, and therefore the want of dignity, for the people of his Republic, occupying in rough measurement the middle third of the northern continent only, wishing or attempting to arrogate to themselves alone the title of American, to which other nations on both continents, and especially British or Canadian citizens covering a larger area in the north, besides several independant Republics to the south, have at least an equal claim.

Another Americanism, productive of inconvenience, though of far less moment, is the adoption, at second hand, of the names of many of our English cities for the more modern United States towns : for instance, our stately cathedral city of York, with its centuries of historic memories, is doubtless a grand and venerable godparent ; nevertheless, the name of *New York* for the business metropolis of the United States Republic, which its children delight to call their "Empire City," is insipid and jejune ; nor, in this matter of names, can we easily imagine any Frenchman, for instance, bestowing such a title as "Bulls' Run" upon a great battle of his countrymen ! But this, after all, is a minor matter of taste (or of its absence), and concerns but little the majority of Englishmen ; but it is otherwise when it comes to the question of appropriating and using for international purposes an incorrect and misleading title to designate their

nationality, formed by the original New England and other federated States, united at present under the Washington Government; and it has become a matter of international polity and convenience that "United Stateslanders" should find a distinctive name for themselves and their country, and that this confusing and improper use of the word American should cease to be employed in correct literature.

For besides bad taste, a more serious mischief is caused by careless acquiescence in the perverted use of this term to denote simply the middle Yankee States, because the habit of thought following, and caused by, the continued misuse of the larger term, is naturally apt to produce a corresponding error in the manner and point of view in which the average Yankee looks at questions in which his group of States and Government are brought into contrast with other American Powers, and more especially with Great Britain, which he likes to regard as an old world, if not effete, European Power, choosing to blink the plain fact that its Government extends over a larger area, even in America, than his own; and the mistaken and exaggerated notions of the status of the Republic, so largely current in the United States, may be traced in great measure to the misuse of this adjective: an Americanism from which has grown the peculiar and self-satisfied dogma known and cherished by United Statesmen under the title of "The Monroe Doctrine." What, then, was the doctrine enunciated by President Monroe? and what bearing has his pious opinion upon the present nations in America? Not a little indifferent ignorance exists in many quarters with regard to the exact value (if it has any) of this pronouncement of opinion, and it may therefore be useful to briefly call to mind the facts.

Mr. James Monroe was the fourth citizen, after Washington, who was elected by his countrymen to be President of their Republic (1817-24), a time when the population of the States amounted only to eight or nine millions, of whom some two millions were slaves. Monroe was a man of considerable ability, though not a genius, and, long before he came to be President, had been engaged in political business in the service of his country. At that time France, as well as Spain and England, was an "American Power," and Monroe, who had been United States Minister in Paris until he was recalled in 1796, had shown much sympathy with the Revolutionary party, to the annoyance of many of his own side; a few years later (1803), taking advantage of Napoleon's anxiety to disentangle himself from possible sources of controversy with the United States in view of his intended action against England, managed to arrange with the First Consul for the purchase by the United States of the port of New Orleans from France, a purchase which, by dexterous management, Monroe afterwards got extended so as to include the whole State of King Louis XIV. (Louisiana), and thus by diplomacy,

without bloodshed, he was enabled peaceably to bring about the exclusion of one European Power from her dominion in America, which had existed long before the Yankee nation was thought of. A few years later (in 1812) Monroe did his best, with what no doubt he considered to be patriotic ideas, to precipitate the war with England, and the United Federal States made various attempts to invade Canada, though with results only disastrous to themselves, for the British Americans boldly met and repulsed the vain efforts made by the Middle American, or Yankee, States to absorb the Northern Dominion, which remained and remains stronger and more loyal than ever.

Time went on, and in the year 1817 James Monroe attained the summit of his ambition, and was elected President of the United States of America. In this position he used his opportunities to continue his policy of extension southward which had been tried in vain to the north, and was able a couple of years after to round off his previous peaceable purchases by obtaining from Spain the important cession of Florida, on the mainland, which became incorporated with the States, although not (unfortunately, perhaps, by the light of future events) of Spain's neighbouring island of Cuba. Thus far, then, Monroe's constant desire and efforts for the exclusion of other Powers from participation in the government of the northern half of the New World had proved to a great extent a practically successful policy, and one which had increased his reputation as a patriot amongst his own people. The idea of "America for the Americans," or, to put it more correctly, the North American Continent for the New England States, was very grateful to the self-esteem of the populace of the young and expanding Republic, and had not so far, disturbed the calm of the senior and dominant partner in North American rule, for the foreign policy of the Federal Republic had been on the whole neutral, as naturally became the Government of a Union of young, self-centred, and semi-independent States far removed from the continual causes of conflict in the Old World, and fully occupied in consolidating their own territories.

But, while proclaiming a policy of non-interference with European politics, in which, from the nature of their genesis and growth, they felt but little interest, the Yankees, calling themselves Americans, began to go a little further, and wished also to declare and maintain the *converse proposition*—viz., that European Powers should not, or must not, exercise their influence or interfere on the American continent; and, had this corollary been definitely limited in its application to the Federal States composing the Union of the North American Republic (as most probably was at first meant), but little fault could have been found with the "doctrine" by the one Power, British America, which was mainly interested.

. But in later years an attempt has been made to put upon this

theory, or "doctrine," a greatly extended meaning, which it was never intended to bear, and which will not be allowed by the other nations interested. And this brings us to consider how and when this "Monroe Doctrine" came to be originally propounded? After the great war which ended at Waterloo, three of the sovereigns of Europe—viz., the Emperors of Russia and Austria and the King of Prussia, entered into a compact known as "The Holy Alliance," by which these despotic rulers bound themselves and their Governments to act according to Christian principles in their political conduct. This philanthropic agreement, which, ostensibly at any rate, was formed to perpetuate the peace just established, had attributed to it, especially by Protestants, a covert design to restore to Catholic Spain her old, but lost, provinces in the New World; but, even if any such design existed, no steps, at any rate, were ever taken to carry it out; still, the United Stateslanders were excited and apprehensive, and their President Monroe, in his official Message to Congress (December 1823), gave expression to his feelings and opinion on the subject, and these short but celebrated sentences may be considered as forming the foundation and marking the birth of the dogma, or Americanism, which has since been generally called the "Monroe Doctrine."

Speaking officially and in somewhat guarded diplomatic language, he said: "We would not view any intervention for the purpose of oppressing them (*i e.*, the Spanish American States), or for controlling in any manner their destiny by any European Power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

To the opinion of Monroe thus stated most Britons will heartily say "Amen!" but since his death, as time has gone on, the growth of a class of professional politicians and office-seekers in the Republic, together with the exaggerated ideas fostered in the masses of the Yankee States by the before-mentioned misuse of the title "American" in its provincial application exclusively to the persons and things of the United States of America, has caused many politicians "of the baser sort" to appeal at times to the underlying vanity and chauvinism always sure to be present in a mixed multitude from all the countries of the world, such as now constitutes the lower strata of population in the United States, and to endeavour to persuade this multitude, in the name of patriotism, that they alone are really the only "Americans" and that the continent of America should be alone for them! They forget, or rather, perhaps, they do not choose to remember, that only a short time comparatively in the history of the world has elapsed since neither "Engleese," Yankees, or Spanish existed upon the continents now called American; that the Empire of Mexico was in its glory ages before; and that the red-skinned Indian was also before them in possession, and roamed at large over

the territories from which he has now almost vanished, and whose last remaining "preserves" are being rapidly swallowed up by the newcomers whom the United States of America represent. The "pious opinion" of President Monroe, strictly limited in scope, and uttered more than seventy years ago, when the Princess Victoria was a child between four and five years old, and when the Federal Republic only contained about one-seventh of its present inhabitants, was for many years kept (as one is not surprised to know) "for use in home consumption only," as a "doctrine," having the character of a comfortable and soothing political medicine, the validity of which was never challenged, for the sufficient reason that it was never officially put forward before other Powers as an active principle, but only alluded to as a theoretical opinion.

Of late years, however, especially since the separation and subsequent conquest of the Southern States, the enormous increase of population in the middle American States, caused mainly by the great stream of European emigration from Ireland, Germany, and Italy, carrying with it not a little of Marah bitterness toward the old countries from which it overflowed, has swelled the numbers and importance of the United States faster than that of the British American Dominion, until the vigorous though wayward child of Britain began so to appreciate its own strength and independence that it was apt to undervalue the same qualities in its parent, and Yankees talked with complacency of the near approach of the time when Canada, with its grain-fields and wondrous chain of lakes, would wish to forsake its loyalty to the grand old Empire, and would humbly seek to be admitted into the Union of Middle States and form a portion of their new Republic!

The desires and dreams of such persons were rudely dispelled when the foolish Fenian incursions across the Canadian border, which they encouraged or winked at not many years ago, were so promptly and ignominiously suppressed by the Dominion authorities, without respect of party, and with the only result of drawing closer than before the silken bonds between Great Britain and her North American colonies.

Another occasion when Monroe's opinion was again tentatively brought forward and its scope and authority attempted to be enlarged was when a European Power, *not* England this time, but France, or at least a company with French money and influence, although with England's tacit approval and sympathy, came forward with the attempt to pierce the Isthmus of Panama by a ship canal, which, if successful, would rival in usefulness that of Suez in its benefits to both hemispheres; then the carpet-bag politicians, and others in the United States, raved and stormed and declared (without producing any effect) that they would not allow any European Power to control the isthmus! as though, forsooth, the Anglo-American power of Britain,

far and away the largest shipowner in the world, would consent to give up the rights of its position, or to forego, for the sake of any "pious opinion," its part and lot in a great scheme of the kind, intended for the benefit of the navies of the world, and this, too, not on Yankee, but on *neutral* territory!

But even yet this so-called "Monroe Doctrine" was not positively formulated to foreign Powers by any responsible "United Statesman," but was treated rather as a sort of magical formula of incantation to be mistily invoked without being plainly enunciated, and it became more and more, amongst home politicians of the United States, an "article of faith," like other such articles, to be accepted without clear definition, and insisted upon as though it had the virtue of a treaty, or at least of a solemn mutual understanding.

It was not until the late years of the presidency of Mr. Grover Cleveland that the Government of the Republic ventured to state their view of this "Monroe Doctrine," and claim for it authority, as though it were an international accepted doctrine, and this in a form very different from its author's original pretension. It then happened that the small South American Republic of Venezuela had entered into a warm dispute with the British Government concerning its boundaries, which this Spano-American Republic of "Little Venice" wished extended so as to include some mining lands exploited by British capital, and hitherto understood to be undoubtedly upon British Guiana territory. The dispute was a small one so far as regarded the British Empire; but it was given some international importance by the somewhat gratuitous intervention of President Cleveland, who was then nearing the end of his term of office, and who, to the amused surprise of England, seized this opportunity to put forth, for the first time officially, his new and improved version of the "Monroe Doctrine," under which he sought now to claim the right, on behalf of the Republic he for a time represented, to have a voice, if not a veto, with regard to independent negotiations between her Britannic Majesty as representing British America in both continents, and another Republic situated not even in that northern half of which the United States form a part, but in the southern moiety in which the United States have no dominion at all. The pretension thus advanced, extravagant as it seems to disinterested neutrals, appears again to us to owe its rise in a main degree to the extreme notions of their own importance fostered amongst the people of the Federal Republic of North America by the habitual misuse or wrong appropriation of the term "American" applied among themselves to themselves.

The "doctrine" thus formally propounded had, of course, to be noticed by Great Britain, and Lord Salisbury, as Foreign Minister, replied in an admirable despatch, alluding to the fact that it was the first time this "Monroe Doctrine" (though so long muttered among

themselves) had been openly enunciated by the United States to another Power, and made the ground of a supposed right of interference, and he pointed out that, if the so-called "doctrine" had been agreed to by the European Powers (which it never had), even then the presumed rights now claimed went much further than ever President Monroe himself suggested, and on the part of Great Britain our Foreign Secretary virtually declined to discuss the "doctrine" thus for the first time officially advanced.

Thus the matter still stands: the Yankee or American Federal view of the long-cherished "Monroe Doctrine" has been advanced and disallowed by Great Britain, whilst the European Powers—Spain, France, Holland, and others interested—have never given any opinion on the subject, nor even had it brought officially under their notice by the one Power which enunciated it on its own behalf. It remains, therefore, the private property and pious opinion of the publicists and people of the United States who invented it, and who, while they remain under one Government, will no doubt continue comfortably to cherish it; but at the same time it continues simply a one-sided statement of policy, without international authority or active force.

Meanwhile, it may be well to notice that the scope of the "doctrine," as originally stated, has not only been greatly altered, but also that the United States seem about to take a new departure in foreign policy by the proposed annexation of the outside and *non-American* territories of Hawaii and the Sandwich Islands—and thus, departing from their old national policy of being a self-contained nation, without colonies or outlying possessions save in North America, they would destroy the main argument which they had in favour of their doctrine of non-intervention of other Powers in the continent of which they form so considerable a portion.

Will it not be well, in conclusion, to suggest to our good cousins in America, our vigorous national offspring, and responsible co-partners in the great office of the good government of a continent, the wisdom of taking into consideration whether they should now any longer attempt to maintain alone a doctrine so one-sided and impracticable in its exaggerated modern character as that which, while taking its name from their early President, James Monroe, differs so widely from his proposition in its scope and character?—whether, at the same time, if they really wish that the two nations from the one Anglo-Saxon stock should advance together in friendship and civilisation, they should not endeavour to remove one minor but unnecessary source of misunderstanding and pique, both amongst themselves in fairly understanding international politics, and with the parent nation in friendly co-operation, by the selection and adoption of some fit and dignified title by which the Great Republic of the western world should describe its great and growing nation? We remember that once in its history, midway in this

reign of our gracious Queen, the United States became *disunited*, and during that disruption the North American States respectively called themselves “Federalists” and “Confederates”; why, then, when reunited, should they not agree to be designated by the former national and historical title? or any other distinctive name which, whilst tending to increase among the people their national self-respect and international recognition, would not trench upon the natural rights belonging mutually to the parent Empire’s American dominions and the other American States, and would go far to render unnecessary, even from the Yankee point of view, the jealous pushing forward of this untenable *new* “Monroe Doctrine?”



The Federalists of the United States may rest assured that Britannia looks with pride, and not with envy, upon the growth of her republican child, and that, for her own part, possessing large territories both in the New and Old Hemispheres, *her* chief “doctrine” and constant aim is, and we trust always will be, the upholding and enforcement of the great “*Pax Britannicum*,” so that, whilst firmly maintaining her own and her people’s rights, she would not object, but would rather prefer, to see those lands or islands, on which it is believed the Yankees have cast longing eyes, under good and peaceable government by the United States than to see them under the bad and restless tyranny of any other Power.







In conclusion, we would ourselves adopt the sense, and, indeed, the very words, of President Monroe, before quoted, without the glosses and extension of later years, and say with him, that Great Britain “would not view any intervention for the purpose of oppressing them (*all* the States of America), or for controlling in any manner their destiny, by any European Power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition” towards herself.

JOSH. COTTLE GREEN.

THE HISTORY OF THE FORMS AND MIGRATIONS OF THE SIGNS OF THE CROSS AND THE SU-ASTIKA.

PART I.—THE CLOUD AND BIRD-MOTHER.

THE Su-astika, one of the earliest and most widely-diffused religious symbols, appears under two forms—the left-hand Su-astika , in which the ends of the cross, its foundation, turn to the left, and the right-hand Su-astika , turning contrariwise, or sunwards. The name “Suastika” is Indian, and the first form is called the Sū-astika, or the female Su-astika, and the second the male. The name Suastika marks it as connected with the great Indian sun-god, called Astika, or the eighth, who is the hero of the second section of the first book of the great national historical epic called the *Mahā-bhārata*. He there appears as the god who helped Janamejaya, the son of Parikshit, the circling sun of heaven, to destroy the Nāga snake-gods of an earlier faith. In studying the history of his symbol we must begin with that of the cross, its historical predecessor.

The five radical forms of the cross are—(i.) the Tau cross , the hammer of Thor, or the cross of St. Anthony; (ii.) the Latin and Celtic cross, with its shaft double the length of its three upper arms ; (iii.) the equilateral upright Greek cross of St. George ; (iv.) the transverse equilateral cross of St. Andrew ; and (v.) the Egyptian and Assyrian Ankh . Their history will best be dealt with by taking first that of the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew, which are most nearly allied to the Suastika. These two crosses, when combined, form the eight-rayed star , the sign of God and seed corn, both called Esh-shu, or the eighth Shu, in the most ancient Akkadian and Chinese script. It was the symbol of the sun, which from the centre of the eight points of the compass, indicated by its rays, surveyed the whole habitable world. It meant to say that the all-seeing sun-god was the god who ripened the grain, which was to the dwellers on earth the bread of life. The Euphratean farmers who framed this sign were the first growers of wheat and barley, which are both the products of Mesopotamian grasses. These first corn-growers, whose sun-god was the eight-

rayed star, called themselves the sons of the rivers, and their special parent river was the Euphrates, called Nahor, or Nahr, the channel, a form of Nagur, the great snake, or plough, which gave the name Naharaina to Mesopotamia, the name by which it is called in the Egyptian annals of Thothmes III. of the eighteenth dynasty, B.C. 1503–1449.¹ This parent river became in the chronological history told by the national genealogies, Nahor, the grandfather of the Semite father, Ab-ram. The traditional distributor of the waters which irrigated the grain grown in the sandy Euphratean soil was Akki, the irrigator, the parent god of the Akkadians or mountaineers, and it was he who, in the Akkadian hymn quoted by Dr. Sayce,² took the great national king, Sargon, from the river on which he had been launched as an infant placed on an ark of bulrushes.

The adoption as their chief god by these sons of the rivers of the eight-rayed sun, who brings in his annual circuit of the heavens the seasonable rains which fill their parent streams, marks the close of the primæval epochs of northern history. During these first ages it was the national custom of the hunting races of the North to begin their year by a sacrificial feast on their totem animals, such as the deer, pig, and wild goat. When they were succeeded by the corn-growing races of the Neolithic age, these annual meals on animal totems were superseded by the gradual introduction of a new sacramental meal on the products of the soil. This in its final form became that of barley, milk and running water, eaten on the national New Year's Day by the new-born united brotherhood consecrated in the baptismal bath of the Indian Soma-worshippers, who were called in India the twice-born races. This baptismal bath in the parent river or the mother-ocean, as a necessary introduction to those allowed to join in the annual feast, is a custom still observed by the Euphratean Sabœans, and it formed part of the ceremonies of the Greek Eleusinian mysteries. The milk, barley, and running water drunk by the Indian Soma-worshippers at their great national festival of the summer solstice find their exact equivalent in the Parsi Drōn, or sacred cake made of butter and wheaten meal, eaten yearly at the same season. They are also the chief ingredients of the Eleusinian cup of Dēmētēr, the Greek barley- (deai) mother, drunk at the autumnal equinox, and this custom, combined with the Jewish and Greek Peloponesian date of the autumnal equinox as their New Year's Day, survives in the Sabœan sacramental cake of barley-meal and oil, eaten yearly on this day by the Sabœans of the Euphrates.³

But in the genealogy of the corn-growing races who worshipped the eight-rayed star and traced their descent from the river Euphrates,

¹ Petrie, *History of Egypt*, vol. ii. pp. 116, 117.

² Sayce, *Hubbert Lectures for 1887*. Lect. i. p. 26, note i.

³ See the ritual of the sacrament as given in Hewitt's *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. ii. essay viii. pp. 156–169.

their earliest parent god was the Armenian and Akkadian cloud-goddess, Shara. Shé, as the mother of the serpent corn-god Serakh, a counterpart of the snake river-god Nagur or Nahur, was called I-shara, the house of Shara.¹ This metaphor was exactly reproduced by the Egyptians, who called the mother of Horus Hathor, or the house (hat) of Hor, and also in India, where the mother of Rāma, the ploughing father of the Kushika Kushites, is called Kush-aloya, the house (aloya) of Kush. Shara was to the Akkadians both the cloud-goddess and also goddess of the grass Shar,² that is, the wild grass from which barley and wheat were produced. She was the cloud-mother of the rains, impregnated as the mother of seed by the sun-god of the eight-rayed star, and in this light she was the mother of the Euphrates, called Nahor; for Serug, who is in Genesis xi. 22 the father of Nahor, is, as Dr. Sayce has shown, the Akkadian Sarganu, born of Sar, the ideal king of the land, found by Akki the irrigator floating on the river in a basket of the bulrushes midst which the river rose.³ This Sarganu, who became the gardener of Akki, is called in the epic of Gilgames the Akkadian Hercules, Si-shig-shig or Si-shim-shim,⁴ "He who makes all things green."

Thus this cloud-goddess was ancestress of Nahor, the river Euphrates, of Terah, meaning the antelope, and of Ab-ram, the father (ab) Ram whom I have shown to be originally the ploughing sun-god of India, the son of Kush-aloya, the house of Kush.⁵ She who gave the fertilising rains which made the grass and corn to grow was in Akkadian astronomy raised to heaven as the watery constellation Aquarius, called Sar.⁶ Mr. Brown has proved that the star Skat in Aquarius was the tenth or last of the ten stars called in Babylonian astronomy the Ten Kings of Babylon. It marked the tenth month of gestation, ending with the birth of the sun-god in Aquarius on November 20.⁷ And it was the mother Sar of this constellation which supplied the winter rains of Babylon and filled the river Euphrates. Shar appears also in another form as the mother of the sun-god, for she was the cloud basket-mother, the bulrush basket from which the river Euphrates was originally born in Armenia, for her name is, as I have shown, a reproduction of the Basque Sare or Zare, or osier basket.⁸ These Basques of Iberia in Asia Minor whence the Euphrates rose, the Ibai-erri or people (erri) of the rivers (ibai), were the men of the forest (baso) who first

¹ Sayce, *Hilbert Lectures* for 1887, Lect. iii, p. 234, note i.; Lect. iv, p. 265, note i.

² *Ibid.* Lect. iv, p. 245, note i.

³ *Ibid.* Lect. i, pp. 27, 28, note i.

⁴ *Ibid.* Lect. iv, p. 247, note i.

⁵ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay v. pp. 471-473.

⁶ R. Brown, junr., F.S.A.; "Remarks on the Tablet of the Thirty Stars," *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, January 1890, Star I, line 1.

⁷ R. Brown, junr., F.S.A.; *The Phenomena of Heavenly Display of Aratus*, p. 31; also two letters written by him in the *Academy* of June 3 and July 15, 1893. Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iv, p. 384.

⁸ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. preface pp. xx. xxi.

grew wheat and barley in Armenia and Asia Minor,¹ and it was they who introduced the ceremonial, in the Eleusinian mysteries of the barley-mother goddess Dēmētēr, in which the young sun-god, the new corn grain of the first fruits, was borne in a basket. Also they are the authors of the historical story which tells how the royal progenitor and teacher of the corn-growing races was found like Sargann and the Hebrew Moses floating on the river in an ark of bulrushes. This is reproduced in the birth myth of Kuvād, the first of the Zend Kavi-kush or wise Kushite kings, who was found in the reeds of Lake Kashava, the modern Zarah, into which the mother Kushite river Hačtūmant,² the modern Helمند of Kandahar, flows; and it was they who, as the Hindu Kushika kings, first brought wheat and barley into India.

Having in the above analysis brought the cloud-mother of the sun-god of the eight-rayed star from Armenia into Mesopotamia and Northern India, I must now follow her migrations still farther, and in the search we find her in the god Sar-sar, the name given by the Sumerians of the Euphratean delta, to Ia, the fish-god.³ This name Ia—the house (I) of the waters (a) shows, like that of Ishara the mother of Serakh, that he was first the mother cloud-goddess, and that the fish-born son of the cloud-goddess is only a reproduction of his mother. These Sumerians were the “black-headed” race of the coasts of the Persian Gulf, dwelling in the land of Shumir, shown by Lenormant⁴ to be the Shinar of the Bible. Their sacred island, called Dilvun, as dedicated to God (dil), is that now called Bahrein, in the Persian Gulf. Its god was En-zag, meaning the first-born (zag) of the creator (en); and he, as Dr. Sayce has proved, was the god subsequently worshipped by the Assyrian Semites, successors of the Sumerians, as Nabū or Nebo, the prophet-god of the Great Deep, or the sea-god who afterwards became the planet Mercury.⁵ In Akkadian he is called Sak or Sakkad, the wet (sak) god,⁶ and also “ak” the “white lord.” The cuneiform ideogram for the last name is composed of two others, meaning “god” (dil) and “running water” (gar);⁷ so that the Babylonian prophet-god of the Great Deep was the god of “running water,” that is, of the parent river, and, like it, the son of the cloud-goddess Shar. This island again is that called by the Phœnicians in their national history Turos, and it was thence, according to Herodotus⁸ and Theophrastus, that they came to Tyre. To them

Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. preface p. xviii., essay iii. pp. 177, 178.

² *West Bundahish*, lxxxi. 24. Darmesteter's *Zendavesta Zaengād Yasht* 66, S. Bt., vol. v. p. 136, xxiii. p. 302, note i.

³ Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures* for 1887. Lect. iv. p. 265. note i.; Lect. iii. p. 143.

⁴ Lenormant, *Chaldean Magic*, pp. 397–406.

⁵ Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures* for 1887. Lect. ii. p. 114. note i. 120.

⁶ Sayce, *Assyrian Grammar*, *Syllabary*, 231, 247. Lenormant, *Chaldean Magic* p. 401.

⁷ Sayce, *Assyrian Grammar*, *Syllabary*, Nos. 87, 1, 476.

⁸ *Herodotus*, vii. 89.

also must be assigned the use of the name *pāti*, which, as Dr. Sayce says, was one of the names of En-zag; for they, as is proved by the name Turos given by them to their island settlement in the Persian Gulf, and their worship of the Pole-star by which they steered their ships, were the great tribe called in India the Tur-vasu or they whose god (*vasu*) is the Tur or revolving pole. He was the Phrygian god, the father Tur, whose name is traced in Cypriote characters on a terra-cotta spindle-wheel found by Dr. Schliemann in the sixth city from the bottom of the buried Trojan cities.¹

These Turvasu were descended from the twin brethren Yadu and Turvasu, sons of the great King Yāyāti, son of the snake-god Nahusha, whose name is perpetuated in that of his son Ya-du, the holy (du) Ya, and of Devayāni, the sun-goddess of the Devayāna, or the six months from the winter to the summer solstice in which the sun goes from south to north. She was the daughter of Kavi Ushana, the god (ana) Ush, who was, as I shall show, the Hindu form of the Finnic rain-bird Uk-ko, and he is proved, in the *Mahābhārata*, to be the rain-god by his saying: "It is I who pour down rain for the good of creatures, and also nourish the plants which sustain all living things."² He was the god of the spring rains.

These sons of the bright sun-daughter of the rain-god and of the father god Ya, apparently a Hindu form of the Akkadian Ia, were, in short, the race we call the Turanians, the people whose god (an) is the Tur or North Pole god; while their brethren, the Yādava, or sons of Yadu, were the children of the southern sun, the sun of the six months intervening between the summer and winter solstices. The Turanians are the Indian counterparts of the Sabœans of Mesopotamia, who had come to India from Asia Minor, bringing with them their Phrygian god Tur, and had there allied themselves with the agricultural and maritime race called the Dravidians. It was they who called the deer star-god Orion, who, as I shall prove, drove, as they believed, the other stars round the Pole, by the name of Prajā-pati, the lord (pati) of living beings. They also gave the name of their god Tur to the solstices which are called, in *Manu*, the Tur-āyana,³ or times of the Tur, the turning god of the Pole-star, who makes the earth revolve on its axis. That these trading settlers on the island of Dilvun, or Turos, were emigrants from India is further proved by the earliest Akkadian inscriptions, those found at Girsu or Telloh. In one of these, giving a list of the land and sea imports to Gir-su, timber called Ghalaka is named as an import from the land of Kūr.⁴ This is the land of India ruled then by the Kurmi and Kaur races, called in the *Mahābhārata* the Kaurāyva. These skilled agriculturists survive still in the modern Kurmis and

¹ Shuchhardt's *Schliemann's Excavations*, app. i. pp. 334, 335.

² *Mahābhārata Adi (Sambhavo) Parva*, lxxviii. p. 243.

³ Bühler's *Manu*, vi. 10, *S.B. E.* vol. xxv. p. 200, note 10.

⁴ Hewitt, *Tracing Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. p. 283.

Kaurs, who are the best farmers in India. 'They first grew cotton for weaving in the country on the west coast, called in the *Mahābhārata* Kārpūsika,¹ the land of cotton (karpas), the modern Guzerat and Kandesh. It is there that the best Indian cotton is still grown, and it was thence that they shipped it to the Euphratean port of Eridu, where the god Ia is said to have landed when he first came to the country in a ship. The cotton cloth brought by these Indian traders is called in the earliest Babylonian inscriptions Sipat Kurri, or the cloth of Kur. They were the first maritime traders in the Indian Ocean, who founded on the western coast of India the eastern shores of that sea, the earliest seaports at Dwārika, the modern Bāraki, Baragzya, now Bharoch, called Prāg-jyotisha, the star (jyotis) of the east (prāg) and Surpāraka (Surat). They built their ships from the shibbuilding timber, the teak, still growing close to the sea near Bharoch on the Nerbudda and Surat on the Tapti. This teak is the wood Ghalaka said in the Gir-su inscriptions to be brought for beams of the temple to the god Gud-ia, the bull (gud) Ia. Its importation shows that the Euphratean Delta must then have been, as it is at present, quite destitute of indigenous timber. The foreign wood best suited for the beams of their temple was most certainly the Indian teak, which, from its strength and its resistance to the attacks of the timber-destroying white ants, is the best house and shipbuilding timber to be found in the Indian forests. It is of Indian teak that the Arabs of Muscat and Bahrein in the Persian Gulf still build their ships, for no shipbuilding timber grows in Arabia or anywhere near the sea in Egypt, or on any of the coasts of the Indian Ocean except those of India. It was from the extreme south of India and from Ceylon that the Phœnician Dravido-Turanian seamen brought their cinnamon, which was, according to Herodotus, one of their chief trading articles;² and it was from India that they first brought the incense, gold, and silver which, with cinnamon and other Indian spices, formed the bulk of their merchandise. The Indian incense gum of the Salai-tree (*Boswellia thurifera*), growing on every rocky mountain-top in Central India, was the first incense burnt in religious ceremonies by Dhaumya, the son of smoke (dhumo), the High Priest of the Pāndavas, who conquered the Kaurāvyas in the great national war told of in the *Mahābhārata*. It was used first in religious services when the worship of the rain-cloud, the goddess Shar, who wreathed the top of the mother-mountain of the sons of the rivers in mist, was transferred from the hills to the shrines built for her worship on the level banks of the parent river. It was brought from India to the Persian Gulf by the Dravido-Turanian traders; and incense wood, called in the Girsu inscription Usha, or the wood of the eight (ush or esh), the wood of

¹ *Mahābhārata Subha (Dyuta) Purāna*, II p 141.

² *Herod.* III. 111.

the god of the eight-rayed star, the supreme god of Girsu, is said to have been imported from the South-west land of Kur-miluk-ka, or Arabia, which seems by its name to be another settlement of the Kurs, who, as emigrants from India, had become the black Himyarites who first ruled Southern Arabia. They ruled the country before the coming of the northern Sabœans, the Hittites, known in Assyria and India as the Kheta or Khati, who, as we shall see, measured their year by the week of seven days instead of the earlier week of five. It was hence they obtained the name of Sabœans, or the sons of seven (Sheba). The incense-tree Usha is also called Gish-kal, the mighty (kal) tree (Gish). It was the Arabian tree, the *Boswellia Carterii*, a very near botanical relation of the Indian *Boswellia thurifera*. It was from this tree that frankincense was extracted by the Arabian descendants of the Indian Dravido-Turvasu, the black (himyar) Himyarites who united with the Turanian Sabœans to form the trading people called Midianites in the Bible. It was from this trade that they obtained the Sabœan name of At-yāb, which is translated as "incense men" by Dr. Glaser. It was this name which was transliterated by the Greeks into that of Æthiopians, called by Herodotus "the black people."¹

It was in India also that the worship of the eight, the eight quarters of the horizon scanned by the seafaring mariners who steered their course by the Pole-star, was made a national cult. It was there, as in Mesopotamia, connected with the worship of the goddess Shar, who was made the goddess of their autumn season, called Shar-ad. This was the fourth season added to spring, summer, and winter, the original three seasons of the corn-growing races of Asia Minor, by the barley-growing Kurs. They had added orchards to their corn-fields, and called themselves sons of the fig-tree of Syria, and, as I shall show later on, of the Indian mango- (am) tree. They united with the earlier immigrants, the Jats or Chiroos, and Turanian Gonds, called themselves Yāvana, the sons of the barley (yava), and also the Bhārata, sons of the Bar fig-tree (*Ficus Indica*), the great banyan-tree, called in Buddhist theology the Negrodhatree, the sacred tree of Kassapo,² the predecessor by several thousands of years of the individual teacher known to history as the Buddha. Kassapo is called, in the popular mythology of the *Māhābhārata*, Kashyapa, the father of the Kushika race of Bhārata, the rulers of Bhārata-varsha, the land of the Bhārata, the ancient name of India. It was they who instituted the annual autumn feast to the dead fathers of the nation, who were called to the sacrificial ground strewn with sheaves of Kusha-grass (*Poa cynosuroides*), the sacred parent grass of the Kushika race. This was a survival of the adoration of the grass of Shar, the wild barley and wheat, and it was the

¹ Herod., iii. 101.

² Rhys David's *Buddhist Birth Stories*, p. 51.

favourite food of the antelope, the Akkadian Dara, a name of Ia and the Hebrew Terah, the father of Abram, who led the sons of the rivers from Syria to India under the guidance of the Lithuanian sun-god Rai or Ragh, who became in India Rā-hu, still the sun-god of the Dosadhs, the fire-priests of Maghada, and of his ancient priest Rāhū-gana, inspired (gana) by Rāhu. He is named in the *Brāhmanas* as the priest of King Māthava, who made fire by rubbing or twirling (math) sticks, and it was they who first introduced into India from the North the god of the household fire called Vaishvānara.¹ Rā-hu, as the god Rāma or Itam was called, was the son of Kushaloya, the house or mother of the Kushikas, and the union of the fathers of the North and the mothers of the South described in this name, is told in the story of King Māthava, who worshipped Rāhu, by calling him the Videgha or king of two (vi) countries (deggha, desha), that is, of the barley and millet land of the northern Turanians and the rice land of the southern Dravidians. It was he who brought the household-fire worship from the Sarasvati to the Sudanira or Gunduk, and the Sarasvati was the original river named after the goddess Shar, and called in the *Zendavesta* the Harah-vaiti. It is that on which Herat now stands, and the country traversed by it was that to the north of Kandahar, watered by the Hačtumant or Helمند, down which, as we have seen, Kavād, the infant ancestor of the Kushite kings, was carried in his ark of bulrushes to the lake Zarah. The antelope leader of these barley-growing votaries of the household fire is still the totem father of all the Indian Brahmins, who wear its skin on the day of their initiation. These antelope and barley-born fathers of the household-fire faith are named the Pitaro-Baris-hadah, or fathers seated on sheaves (barhis) of Kusha-grass. They were called to their annual festival of the Shar-ad, sacred to the mother-goddess Shar, at the autumnal equinox. This was, as we have seen, the New Year's Day of the Sabæan Pole-star worshippers and of the original votaries of the Greek barley-mother Dēmētēr of the Eleusinian Mysteries, for it was at the autumnal equinox that the Eleusinia and the Athenian Nekusia, or feast to the dead, were held. This festival, still popularly called in India the Shraddha, or autumn feast to the dead, is in the ritual of the *Brāhmanas* the Sāka-medha, or sacrifice (medha) of Sāka—that is, of the rain-god, the Sak, or wet prophet-god Nābu of the Euphratean delta, who was the son of the Akkadian goddess Shar. The feast to the dead accompanying the sacrifices to Indra and the Maruts, the rain and wind gods of the south-west monsoon wind, the Akkadian Martu, marked, as we shall see presently, in the account of the earlier year measured by the setting of the Pleiades in November, the beginning of the new year. This year of four seasons, made their official year by the barley-growing races of Southern Europe and South-western Asia, was the successor of the earlier years of three seasons of the deer-star Orion,

¹ Eggeeling's *Ex. Brāk.* I. 4, 1, 10-14; *S. B. E.* vol. xii. pp. 104, 105.

beginning at the winter solstice, and that of the Pleiades divided into two seasons of six months each, beginning in November and May.

The year, which began as the Jewish years still do with the evening of the autumnal equinox, became, as I shall now proceed to show, that represented as the eight-rayed star by the Greek cross of St. George, while the transverse cross of St. Andrew completing the star marked that beginning not with the setting, but with the rising, of the sun at the winter solstice. Thus these two years and their respective crosses marked the two salient forms of Pole-star worship, the one adoring the Pole-star and the stars which circle him during the night, and the other the rising sun who circles him by day.

The story of the descent into India of the worshippers of the Pole-star and household fire under Māthava and Rāhugana is repeated in a variant form in the Gond national epic of the 'Song of Lingal.' There the northern immigrants are represented as coming down the Jumna, the Yamuna, or river of the Twins (Yama), from the cave where they were reborn, and settling in Central India on the tortoise (kush) earth of the Kushikas, in the land called by them Mahā-Koshala. On their way down the Jumna, they established the ancient shrine of Mathura, sacred to the god who made fire by rubbing (math), the god still worshipped there as Hari, a form of the mother Shari, as the lightning-cloud. She further appears in the *Rigveda* as Saranyu, wife of Vivasvat, he of two (vi) forms, darkness and light. She is mother of the twins Ushāsā-Nakta, day and night, and these twins are in Zend mythology Yima, meaning twins, the sons of Vivanhant, the Zend form of Vivasvat, who first cultivated the garden of God. Hari, again, is a name of the god Krishna, meaning the black antelope, who is in popular mythology the eighth son of Vāsu-deva. The god Vasu is called in the *Mahābhārata* the King of Chedi, the land of the birds (ched or chir), and is said to have planted on the Kymore hills, called in the text Sakti,¹ the bamboo rain-pole, the ashra of the Jews, called Ba'al (meaning, according to Professor Hirschfeld, the husband of the land). This range forms the southern boundary of the valley of the Ganges south of Benares, the ancient Kashi, and was consecrated to the mother-goddesses of rain (Sak), and Sakti is the name by which the mother-goddesses of the Yoni are still known in India. Vasu crowned this Sakti-pole with a garland of lotuses sacred to Indra, the rain-god; and a similar garland of lotuses is engraved on the early prehistoric statues of the goddess Min found by Mr. Petrie in the lowest layer of buried temples at Koptos in Egypt.² These statues are shown by their position and, like those

¹ *Mahābhārata* Adī (adītarāhavatarna) Parva, lxiii. pp. 172-175.

² Petrie, *History of Egypt*, vol. i. p. 14.

of Gir-su, by their rude and archaic workmanship, to be far older than any of the pyramids.

This goddess Min was the mother-goddess of the great Minyan race, who founded the Minyan empire of Asia Minor, and were sons of the time-measuring (men) god, their king Minos, the Indian Manu. They were the irrigating agricultural race who made the still existing underground channels which drain the Lake Copais in Bœotia, and it was they who, with the Sabœans, succeeded the Himyarites or black Indian Dravidians in the rule of Arabia. Min, their mother, was, in Egyptian mythology, the virgin star-goddess now called Spica Virginis. She is depicted in pictorial astronomy as the virgin bearing one or sometimes three ears of corn; and to the Akkadians she was, as I have shown in the *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i., Essay iv. pp. 359 ff., one of the seven Lumasi, or guardian-stars, who apparently ruled the earlier year of three seasons of the first corn-growers. I have there stated that 'Virgo was the guardian of the young sun-god born in the cradle of the ark of bulrushes, the constellation Su-gi of the Great Bear, who watched over him as her Hebrew counterpart Miriam watched over the young Moses for three months.' She was thus the goddess of the spring, who nursed the young sun-god of the year of three seasons born at the winter solstice; and Māsu or Moses, the leader of the Lu-masi, is shown by his name to be a variant form of the Akkadian "Mas," meaning, like "Dara," the antelope. It is this antelope Mas which, as we shall see presently, is one of the rulers of an Akkadian year of four seasons. The god Vasu, who set up this rain-pole on the Sakti mountains, is the god of the Takkas of the Punjab, placed by them as the central prong of their trident triad-god, called Shesh Nāg, Bāsuk Nāg, and Takht Nāg, the three seasons of the year. They were the pioneer race of artificers (taksh) who inaugurated the early Bronze Age, and who, as I have shown in the *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i., Essay iii. pp. 190 ff., came down to India from the land of Balkh and founded the great city of Taxila, called Takka-sila, the rock (sila) of the Takkas, so famous in Buddhist mythology. This is the city which, in the *Mahābhārata*, Janamejāya took before he completed with the aid of Astika the great sacrifice of the snake-gods of the Polar-star Age of night worship. The tribal leader of the Takkas is called in the *Mahābhārata* Vāhlika, or the man of Balkh, the sacred city on the Oxus, the river rising on the Pamir plateau, the mother-mountain Meru of Indian cosmogony. It was first called the Ji-hun, the creator (hu) of life (ji), the Gihon of the Garden of Eden in Genesis. This root ji is a reproduction of the Akkadian zi, meaning life, which appears in the Greek zea, barley, and in its Cretan form deai, also in the Greek Theos and the Latin Deus, meaning God; thus the

¹ Exod. ii. 3, 4.

name Ji-hu-n for the Oxus, shows that it was the river of life to the barley-growing Kushite races. The same idea also underlies the word Rāsa, containing the root Ra, by which the Oxus is called in the *Rigveda*, for it means moisture—the mist which, in the Creation story of Genesis ii. 6, rose from the face of the ground when man was first created. This analysis also shows us that the Akkadian example of allotting the ideogram of the eight-rayed star to mean barley and God has been continued in Greek, where barley is called the plant of life and God its author.

As for Hu the creator, Hu and Shu or Su, the first syllable in the name of the Suastika are, as I shall show presently, variant forms of the original Khu, the sacred bird of the Akkadians and Egyptians, and this bird originally was the flying-cloud, a metaphorical name for the mother, Shar. Her name, again, takes us back to an earlier form, Khar or Khur; the Indian Chir or Cher, meaning the bird; and also to the Icelandic and Low-German Skaard and Skard, for a piece of pottery; and to the northern name Scarr, meaning a sea or mountain-rock on which the mother-cloud bird rested.¹ It was under the influence of this rotation of meanings that the hawk-wife of Vasu, the King of the Chiroos, or the bird-born race, who became the mother of the fish-born royal race of India, was named Adrikā, or the rock. The god Jehovah of the Jews is, in the prayer prescribed in their liturgy for daily use, addressed as a bisexual god: "The holy Hu, with his Shechinah, the hidden Hu."² In Zend mythology he is the mother-mountain, called Hu-kairya, the active creator, whence the goddess born of the cloud-mother Shar, called Ardvi Sūra Anāhitā, the high, powerful, and undefiled,³ descended to water the earth as the mother-river Euphrates. Hu is also the god of the Druids; and in the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, xvii. 22, Hu and Shu are called the first children of Rā, who is the Indian sun-god Rā-hu, in whose name Hu also appears.

Vāhlika, the leader of the Kushite artisans, sons of the river of life, appears in the *Mahābhārata* as one of the chief leaders of the Kaurāvyas accompanied by his ten sons. They all marched under the banner of the Yūpa or sacrificial stake, still the national Takka trident; and the caste-mark painted on the foreheads of all Vishnuvites, or the followers of the god Vishnu in India, is a trident formed of a red perpendicular line between two oblique yellow lines. It depicts the union between the sons of the red father and the yellow Turanian mother. Also, as this trident was to the Takkas the symbol of the year-god of the year of three seasons beginning with the spring, consecrated to the wet (Sak) god, the Gond Sek and the Takka Shesh Nāg, so Vāhlika and his ten

¹ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. preface pp. xxii., xl.-xliv.

² *Ibid.*, vol. ii. essay ix. pp. 303, 304.

³ Darmesteter, *Zendavesta Abūn Yasht*, Introduction. *S. B. E.*, vol. xxiii. p. 52.

sons represented the eleven sacrificial stakes set up at the shrine of the fire-god at Mathura, the birthplace of Krishna or Vishnu, the trident-god. It was to these stakes that at the summer and winter solstice of the Turāyana the victims then offered at the animal Vedic sacrifices preceding the Soma sacrament were tied. These eleven victims and their stakes represented the eleven lunar months of gestation of the sun-horse, a calculation of time by months which, as I have shown elsewhere, preceded the division of the solar year into similar fractions.¹

These Takkas succeeded the earlier Turanian immigrants from the North, the Gonds who grew millet and oilseeds imported from Asia Minor, and who called themselves, as they still do, Koi-tor, the sons of the mountain (koh), the mother Kai-Kaia of the Bhārata. They, as we are told in their national epic, the "Song of Lingal," were released from their mother-mountain cave at the sources of the Jumna by the black Bindo bird, the cloud-bird of the south-west monsoon, who brought to them their leader Lingal, the father god of the Linga. It was he who, with the permission of Mahā-deva, the creating god, the mother Pole-star, led them down the Yamuna or Jumna, the river of the twins (Yama), to Central India. They took with them, as the image of their god, the first form of the Takka trident called Pharsi Pen, or the female (pen) trident (pharsi), consecrated to the goddess still worshipped in Maghada and Omissa as Tarā Pennu, the female Pole-star. These three mothers represented the three mothers of the year of three seasons, which was, as I have explained, symbolised in later mythology by the male father god with his two tiger wives.² These wives were in Asia Minor the two cats who drew the car of the hawk-mother of the sun-god, whose place in the mythological history of Greece, Scandinavia, Asia Minor, and India will be explained presently.

The central god of the Takka trident, Bāsuk Nāg, the King Vasu of Chedi, was a god whose name, as is shown by the Sanskrit Varsha and the Hindi Barsat, meaning rain, was originally Barash or Varash. He was the god who became Varuna in the *Rigveda*, called in the *Brāhmanas* the god of barley, there said to be Varuna's corn; and it is to him that the festival of the summer ending with the breaking of the rains at the summer solstice is dedicated in the Brāhmanic ritual of the year of three seasons.³ It is also these growers of Varuna's corn who are said to have introduced marriage, called "Varuna's noose," into India, thus marking the introduction of his worship as beginning the age which substituted the Basque custom of patriarchal personal marriage, together with the "couvade," of the father, for the matriarchal customs of marriage between villages,

¹ Hewitt, *History of the Week*. WESTMINSTER REVIEW, August 1897, pp. 126 ff. September 1897, pp. 237 ff.

² Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. p. 193.

³ Eggeeling's *Sat. Brāh.*, ii. 2, 5, 21, 2. *S. B. E.* vol. xii. p. 391.

which I have described in the *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i., Essay iii., pp. 153-157.¹ It is the god Vasu who is said in the *Mahābhārata* to have placed beneath Mount Mandara the hill Parisnath, on the Burrakur in Chutia Nagpore, Shesh Nāg, who as Sek, the god of the rains of the south-west monsoon coming from the Persian Gulf, had formerly ruled the summer season, the charge of which was now entrusted to Varuna. Mandara had become the mother-mountain of the Indianised Kushika, in place of Meru, the mother-mountain of the northern Kurus, or Kaurāvyas, also called the Takkas. It was thought to be the central axis of the earth resting on the ocean and Shesh Nāg, and was made to revolve by the rope of time bound round it by Vasuki, who turned it as the fire-drill of the Hindu sacred fire is turned in the fire-socket by the string tied round it and pulled by the hands of the kindling priest. It was by turning the mountain drill in the ocean-sockets encircled by the rain-snake Shesh Nāg that he raised to earth Uccaishravas, meaning "the long-eared" horse, that is, the ass of Indra the rain-god, bearing on its back the sign of the revolving Latin cross with a shaft twice as long as its arms—depicting the year of three equal seasons made to revolve and raise up rain from the ocean by the lower handle of the shaft, which doubled its length.² Vasu was wedded to two wives—(giri-kā, the mountain (giri) on which he planted the fire-drill handle, the bamboo pole of the rain-god and the hawk-mother, called Adrikā the rock in the *Mahābhārata*. She is known to the Chiroos of Chutia Nagpore—the sons of the bird (Chir) of the land of (hedi, whose king was Vasu—as Besra, their totem hawk-mother. She was the hawk-mother not only of the Chiroo mining races of India, but also of the miners of Egypt, Greece, and Asia Minor, where she was worshipped as Hat-hor, the mother of Horus the sun-god, Kirke, and Freya.³ Adrikā, as the mountain hawk, the rock bird, was the mother of the fish sun-god Matsya and of his twin sister Satyavati, meaning she who is endowed with truth.⁴ These twin children were born as fish in the river Tamasa, meaning the darkness, the modern Tons, also called Andhamati, the equivalent of Andhas-mati, the mother of plants (andhas), which is a tributary of the Yamuna or Jumna. Thus this birth story tells us that the royal race of the Matsya, ancestors of the Kushika kings of India, who ruled the land from their capitals—Kushambi, the mother (ambi) of Kush, where the Jumna and the Ganges meet, and from Kashi, now Benares, on the Ganges—were born from the hawk-mother of the mining races of Central India, and in the river

¹ See also *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iv. p. 381 for the Basque couvade.

² *Mahābhārata Adī (Astika) Parva*, cx.-xxiii. West, *Bundahish*, ix. 1, 11. *S. B. E.*, vol. v. pp. 67-69.

³ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. preface xxxvii-xxxix.

⁴ *Mahābhārata Adī (Adivansavakīrṇa) Parva*, lxiii. p. 171.

of the Twins. Its meaning is that the royal trading race, whose totem was the fish-god, succeeded the earlier shepherd sons of the sacrificial stake who made the twins Night and Day, the children of the cloud-mother Sar-anyu, the measurers of their national time. It was they who first, as I have shown elsewhere, measured time by the week of seven, instead of the earlier week of five days, and who divided their year of gestation first into ten lunar months, the time of gestation of the lunar cow and the human mother, and afterwards into eleven lunar months, the birth months of the sun-horse. It was during their rule that the agricultural tribes, who measured time by the earlier weeks of five days and six days, changed their year from three to four seasons, and began it with the sacred fourth season of the autumnal equinox. This was the year ruled by the rival twins to the fish-children of the sun-hawk, the antelope sun-god Krishna and his twin sister Durgā, the mountain who was, as the wife of Vasu, Giri-kā. Also these two sets of twin parent gods of the maritime traders and the agricultural farmers were the successors and descendants of the earlier twins, the gods of night and day.

Satyavati, the fish-twin mother of the merchant kings of India, began her career by becoming the mother of the great parent god of all the ruling heroes of the *Mahabharata* epic. He was begotten on 'an island in the Jumna by his father Parāshara, whose name means the cloud breaking (shara) above (parā), a male form of the cloud-goddess Shara suited to the new patriarchal age. He was, as I have shown, the god Vy-ansa of the *Rigveda*, I. 32-3, the cloud-god with two (vi) shoulders (ansa) slain as the year-god by Indra the rain-god at the summer solstice on the day of the Tri-kadrū-ka festival.¹ He was also called Na-muchi, the antelope-god slain by Indra,² whose name, as explained in Benfey's *Glossary*, means he who does not deliver up rain. He was thus the antelope-god who led the barley-growing races from Asia Minor to India. He was begotten in a mist, the mountain mist—whence the mother-cloud was born; and it was he whose name in the form Vyāsa means the uniter who was the connecting-link which joined the trading and artisan immigrant races—who looked on the sun-god of the earth which turned on its own axis in the revolving mountain as the ruler of the year—with the primæval agricultural and maritime Turano-Dravidians, who measured time by the revolutions of the heavens with the constellations, Pleiades, Orion, and the earlier sun-god (the sun) antelope round the Pole; all these being moved, as I shall show presently, by the Gond'ape and tree- (marom) god Maroti, who from the top of the world's tree made the heavens and not the earth revolve.

This uniting father god became by the wives of his deceased half-

¹ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay i. p. 10 ff.; essay v. pp. 423 428.

² *Rig.* v. 34, 2.

brother Vichitra, Virya, the manly (vir) strength of the two colours (chitra), father of the blind King Dhritārāshtra, he who holds (dhrit) the kingdom (arāshtra) together, the blind gnomon stone which marks the apparent motions of the sun ; and of Pandu, the fair prince whom I shall show to be the antelope-god of the seven father antelope-stars of the Great Bear, called in India the Seven Rishya or antelopes. It was from their wives that the Kaurāvyas and Pāndavas, the two fish and antelope ruling races of India, were born. Throughout the national historical epic of the *Māhabhārata* Vyāsa, called the "great and terrible black priest," was the adviser of the two contending factions of the two antagonistic cultivating and trading races, and it was to him they resorted in all their difficulties.

To understand the legend and completely comprehend the real historical meaning of Vyāsa we must turn to the Gond story of the "Song of Lingal," telling in the Gond vernacular of the descent down the river of the Twins of the millet-growing Gonds, who were, as we have seen, the vanguard of the barley-growing Takkas. The four Gonds who were to be the ancestors of the new race, the growers of imported northern crops, were on their journey down the river, first saved by Puse, the alligator, also called Mugral, from the floods caused by the rains of the south-west monsoon, brought by the black Bindo bird, and he afterwards tried to drown them. Lingal rescued them from his clutches, and took them on board his boat, called Dame the tortoise. This was the tortoise-earth churned from the sea together with the ass of the year-cross by Vasu, the land whose centre was the mother-mountain, in whose shadow the house-building family races dwelt.

Puse was the god Pūshan of the *Rigveda*, who is said to be the twin-brother of Indra, and to whom barley, the food of the Turvasu fathers, was offered.¹ He was first the alligator of the sons of the rivers and afterwards the black-bull god of the ploughing races, called Pashang in the *Zendavesta*. He is also said in the *Rigveda* to be drawn through the seas of heaven by goats, the animals who drew Pashang, and to goad the stars in their courses.² Thus, in this second phase of his mythological history, he is the black moon-bull of the ploughing races, who worshipped the god of generation, symbolised by the goat-god, and measured time by the months of gestation of the moon-cow. As the earlier alligator star-god he is the son of the river-born lotus-mother, for the lotus, sacred to the Indian god Vasa, is called Push-kara, or the maker of Push. Thus we see in this analysis that the worship of the alligator Puse was an intermediate stage intervening before that of the worship of the black cloud, the moon-bull of the tortoise-earth, the Pūshan of the

¹ *Rig.* vi. 55, 5 ; vi. 57, 2. Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. p. 274 ; essay v. p. 436.

² *Ibid.* vol. i. essay iii. p. 190 ; essay v. pp. 437-440. *Rig.* vi. 58 1, 2, 3 ; iii. 62, 9.

Rigveda, who ends his career by wedding the sun's daughter¹ as Parā-shara wedded Satyavati, daughter of the sun-hawk.

This alligator-god, also called Mug-ral in the "Song of Lingal," is now the sacred god Mug-ger of the dwellers on the mother-river Ganges, and in the holy land of Maghada, the land of the god Rā-hu, where tanks have been dug for his residence and temples built for his worship. He is the crocodile called Maga-Sebek in Egyptian theology, the god of the Moctis Lake who is wedded to the goddess Shadid,² and his name Sebek, from the root sb to join, means, like that of Vyāsa, the uniter, and he played the same part in Egyptian theology as Vyāsa did in that of India, for he united the barley-growing sons of Osiris to the earlier immigrants from India who worshipped the god Set, whose name from the root St, to conquer, means the vanquished god, who was first the god Hapi, the Egyptian form of the Hindu-Tamil Kapi, an ape, the Gond god Maroti. Shadid, his wife, is the Egyptian goddess of the city of the grave (Shad), a city, like that of Gudua, maintained by the Akkadians and dedicated to Ud-Gudua, the star Spica, a Virginis.³ This custom of building funeral cities survives in India in the great national burying-place of the Mundas, or mountaineer races, in the province of Tamar, in Chutia Nagpore. Thus the Egyptian goddess Shadid is the equivalent of the Indian goddess Shar, the goddess of the national ritual of the Shraddha, or Liturgy of the Dead.

¹ *Rig.* vi. 55, 4; v. 58, 4.

² R. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der Alten Ägypter*, p. 156.

³ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iv. p. 359. Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures* for 1887. Lect. iii. p. 191 ff.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

II.

IN the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for last November I ventured to express some of the conclusions which have grown into conviction in my own mind from considerable experience of the practical working of our Irish intermediate system of education. Some time later I sought, by means of a circular, to elicit the views of the headmasters of all the well-known schools in the country. It was deeply gratifying to find, from the number of replies I received and from the great trouble so kindly taken to give me the fullest information, that interest in the question is very keen, and that it largely occupies the thoughts of those best qualified to aid in its solution. I received replies from forty headmasters, of whom six differed altogether from my views; seven, representing schools which, perhaps, should be regarded as one, declined to offer any opinion; and the remaining twenty-seven agreed with me substantially or entirely. Eighteen was the number of those who ranged themselves on my side without reserve. There is in these figures, and still more in the able and thoughtful letters I have received, and in the high standing of many of the writers, ample evidence of deep and well-founded discontent with the existing state of secondary education in Ireland. Nobody could accuse the article in the November issue of this REVIEW of mincing words in denunciation of the evils complained of, yet very few have considered it exaggerated. The letters of those who accept the views I have already expressed emphasise in a remarkable manner the existence of serious dissatisfaction with the system of competitive examination, and that not alone in the smaller schools, which naturally feel the pressure of competition most, but also in many of the great schools of which the country is justly proud, those whose pupils are most numerous, whose equipment is of undoubted excellence, and whose success is as unquestioned as it is brilliant. It would appear, in the circumstances, not unreasonable to expect that the Board would carefully consider whether their zeal and energy may not be working grave evil through being largely misdirected.

The objections to my views, made by my correspondents, fall mainly under two heads: cramming and inspection. Some, though not many, headmasters are of opinion that "the system is not *necessarily* a system of cram; it may be made a means of imparting solid education and exact knowledge." The obvious weakness of that word *necessarily*, which is underlined in the letter from which I quote, seems to have struck the advocates of that view, for they all endeavour to support it by warm reference to the "enlightened conscience of the headmaster." It is not easy for a headmaster to discuss this matter of conscience, in which his personal interest is so active, but it is no disparagement of the teacher's conscience if the public demand from us the same guarantees as are insisted upon in all business relations between honourable men. To require a receipt for money paid, or a binding document specifying the terms of an agreement, implies no suspicion of the honesty or honour of those with whom we may have dealings; nor does the existence of a public auditor argue any actual distrust of public servants. If the conscience of the headmaster is to be the only, or the chief, safeguard of the efficiency of the school and the soundness of the education on which the public will insist, the problem before the Intermediate Board would be a very simple one indeed. But is it of any practical use, in dealing with this question, to shut one's eyes to the fact that no Board can spend the money of the State without a tangible test and an ample guarantee of the results of its expenditure? Such test and such guarantee presuppose, of course, in all cases honour and conscience in those into whose hands the money passes in return for their services, but in their actual operation they most properly ignore every such consideration. Indeed, the weakness of the Intermediate System, as a public test of the schools, is that, while it offers large and tempting bribes to those who will abuse it and sacrifice the sense of duty to the intoxication of success, it does not, and, without radical change, cannot give the public the least assurance that those whom it leads into temptation are so far above human weakness as to be proof against such dangerous allurements. It is not a question of whether a headmaster is sincere or pharisaical when he declares, "I am not as other men; such practices do not prevail in my school." What the public have a right to demand is that such practices *cannot* prevail in his school. In the vocabulary of teachers and pupils alike a very definite meaning is attached, under the competitive system, to the phrase, "What will pay," and it is a literal and sordid meaning. Cramming will pay; neglect of everything that cannot be tested in writing will pay; the selection of subjects, without regard to their fitness or usefulness, will pay; undue attention to clever pupils, involving injustice to the others, will pay. These are grave statements, but, unfortunately, they are true. The intermediate examinations test little more than the

amount of knowledge a pupil has accumulated; they are powerless to determine whether he has acquired it mainly by his own exertions, which alone is true education, or has got it from his master in labelled parcels. Few of the graces of scholarship and culture are capable of being tested by written examination! How can we be sure that they are imparted, when it is notorious that in many schools foreign languages are taught exclusively by spelling, and pronunciation is absolutely unknown? If, as so often happens, a boy of tender years can learn languages more easily than mathematics or natural science, he is forthwith relentlessly specialised, and presented for examination in an imposing array of languages, while the miserable minimum of mathematics absolutely required by the Board is considered sufficient for him, and natural science is not thought of. The successful pupils only will be paid for, and the possession of a few exhibitioners weighs more in the estimation of the rather heedless public than anything that it is in the power of a headmaster to do for his pupils as a whole. These are the naked facts, and they prove one thing, at least, to demonstration, that the less a master is trammelled by a strict sense of duty the easier does the road to success become.

The evils of the examination system are by no means confined to Ireland, as was shown by a "Protest against the Sacrifice of Education to Examination," signed by an array of 413 names distinguished in education, in letters, and in public life.

In the very first paragraph of the Protest is the remarkable statement: "Children are treated by a Public Department, by managers and schoolmasters, as suitable instruments for earning Government money." A blunt and humiliating declaration, but undeniably true. "We hold that the preponderating influence of examinations destroys the best teaching. Under it the teacher loses his own intelligent self-direction. He cannot devote his powers to such parts of a subject as are most real to himself and most deeply felt by himself (though on this depend the impressiveness of all teaching and the awakening of permanent interest in those taught), as he is constantly controlled by the sense of the coming examination, in which of course he wishes his pupils to succeed. The pupil, on the other hand, allows himself to be mechanically guided for the sake of success. His mental sympathies become bounded by the narrowest horizon. "What will pay" in the examination becomes his ruling thought, and he turns away from the many new intellectual interests, which would spring up on all sides of one who was allowed to be in love with knowledge for its own sake, as from luxuries that must be sternly put aside for the sake of success in the all-important examination." The Protest further emphasises the evils of the system, "the temporary strengthening

¹ *Nineteenth Century*, November 1888.

of the rote-faculties to the neglect of the rational faculties, the rapid forgetfulness of knowledge acquired, the cultivation of a quick superficiality and power of cleverly skimming a subject, the consequent incapacity for undertaking original work, the desire to appear to know rather than to know, the forming of judgment on great matters where judgment should come later, the conventional treatment of a subject and loss of spontaneity, the dependence upon highly-skilled guidance, the belief in artifices and formulated answers." It is not surprising that the signatories go on to say: "We have made of our education a body without a soul. Our misdirected efforts result in a system which is *corruptio optimi*. Examination is a good educational servant, but a bad master. It necessarily exerts a fatal influence whenever it is made of such importance that teachers simply conform to an external standard, lose faith in themselves, sink into the position of their own text-books, and give but little of their own personality to their work. It is true that it is necessary to test the work of teachers, but it is not necessary for the purpose of doing so to take the whole soul out of teaching."

When one bears in mind that all this censure has been pronounced on the examination system as it is found in England one finds it difficult to imagine how trenchant would be the invective of those vigorous pens if they had to deal with the concentrated venom of the mischief in an examination which would pit against one another all the schools of the country in a mad, reckless race for first place, with victory as the reward not of excellent work and high averages, but of the number of individuals who can be got to beat their fellows, by a head. It must not be forgotten or overlooked that this scathing denunciation has been called forth, not by any culpability of the teachers, but by the inherent and inevitable tendency of the examination system; and, in Ireland, this one huge examination practically controls all secondary education. The actual knowledge acquired by the pupils of secondary schools is of no practical value in comparison with the training it may imply. The training alone is education, and ought, in consequence, to be the primary object of the master's care. The examinations, however, absolutely reverse the perspective, giving chief, indeed almost exclusive, prominence to the knowledge. Nor is this all: such value as a schoolboy's knowledge has is merely the value of a means to an end. His knowledge of classics, for instance, has no other value but to enable him, when his mind is more matured, to read classic literature with ease, and to derive from it that true scholarship and culture which cannot be gathered from any other source. But the knowledge which is of use for this purpose is an intimate acquaintance with the rules and principles and general features of the language, and with such exceptional forms and constructions as are of frequent occurrence, while the examinations almost wholly ignore all this, and fasten mainly on "points," exceptions and irregularities, which are out of

the way and obscure. In mathematics too, the knowledge which is of real value is the grasp of principles, of theorems, and formulæ, and of the processes by which they are arrived at, the true basis for the higher study of the subject; but the examinations test chiefly that almost mechanical skill in solving puzzles which comes from working, under a crammer's guidance, innumerable typical examples of every possible kind. So impressed was John Stuart Mill with the overwhelming importance of training as compared with mere knowledge throughout the whole course of a liberal education that, speaking even to University students, at St. Andrew's, in 1867, he solemnly warned them that: "Men are men before they are lawyers or physicians, or merchants or manufacturers, and if you make them capable and sensible men they will make themselves capable and sensible lawyers and physicians. What professional men should carry away with them from an University is not professional knowledge, but that which should direct the use of their professional knowledge, and bring the light of general culture to illuminate the technicalities of a special pursuit." With blunt directness he declares further: "Education makes a man a more intelligent shoemaker, if that be his occupation, but not by teaching him how to make shoes; it does so by the mental exercise it gives and the habits it impresses." Lest there should be any misunderstanding as to his meaning, he explains that the province of this stage of training ends where education, "ceasing to be general, branches off into departments adapted to the individual's destination in life." If intermediate education in Ireland is not very nearly the converse of this ideal, the teachers of our schools deserve to be regarded, individually and collectively, as examples of phenomenal and heroic incorruptibility for their resistance to the seductions of a system which has been described by many of the headmasters as "wholesale bribery."

It is no part of my present purpose to deal with many suggestions which have been made for piecemeal improvement of the intermediate system, but some which may be conveniently grouped together raise an issue of no mere partial importance. The impression seems to be general that the preparatory grade, a rather recent addition, has not proved beneficial to the interests of secondary education or of schools which are strictly secondary. Many would extend to the junior grade much of their condemnation of the preparatory, and there seems little room to doubt that the secondary schools proper would welcome, if not the actual abolition of the examinations in these two grades, at least such a substantial modification of them as would practically deprive them of their competitive character. The age limits of these two grades combined are twelve and sixteen, and the matter for examination is necessarily elementary, with the result that, even in the opinion of those who object to have the whole system described as cram, the danger of that evil practice is very real in these lower grades, and requires to be jealously watched and

carefully guarded against. In this connection it is instructive to note the number of boys who pass in each grade. For the past three years the numbers have been :

	1895.	1896.	1897.
Preparatory grade . .	1421	1501	1643
Junior „ . .	1642	1598	1707
Middle „ . .	346	303	344
Senior „ . .	176	160	186

In face of these figures one would naturally say that abolition of the junior and preparatory grades would mean practical abolition of the entire system, and this is unfortunately true. Yet it is by the number of those who complete their secondary education the success of the system must be judged. The purpose of the Act of 1878 was to promote secondary education, not to induce large numbers to enter on that stage and abandon it when they had mastered its elements. It may be said that many boys turn aside from that course of general culture, which is what we here understand by secondary education, at about the age of seventeen. That is true, but not of any large proportion of the pupils of intermediate schools proper, and we must certainly seek elsewhere for an explanation of the extraordinary fact that, of those who pass the junior grade, only about one-fifth get through the middle and about one-tenth through the senior grade. It may not be out of place to remark that the difficulty of passing in the middle grade is responsible for a considerable falling off. The Royal University has so arranged its programme for the Matriculation pass that it is practically identical with the middle grade intermediate programme, and one would naturally expect that any pupil who could matriculate in the University would also be able to pass the intermediate examination in the same subject-matter. But it is not so by any means; a pupil hopelessly unable to pass the middle grade intermediate examination might be presented for the University Matriculation with something like certainty of success. The reason simply is that the matriculation is a mere pass examination on pass papers, while the middle grade intermediate is a pass examination on honours papers. But that which contributes more than all other causes combined to the amazing disproportion between the numbers who pass in the junior grade and those who are successful in the higher grades is the present form and constitution of the preparatory and junior grades themselves. They do not go beyond the mere elements of secondary education, and they are open to the fullest and freest competition, with the result that these two grades are literally swamped with pupils of the upper forms of schools which cannot possibly be described or regarded as other than primary. This means a diversion to primary schools of an immense proportion of the income of the Intermediate Education Board. It means, too, that an immense proportion of those who pass in the preparatory and junior grades never go, and are not meant to go, any farther in

secondary studies. It is difficult to believe that the Intermediate Board can continue to overlook this glaring anomaly. But it must not be imagined that the exclusion of primary schools, and a consequent increase in the pecuniary rewards to pupils and schools in the higher grades, would be an effective remedy if the inducements held out continue to be conditioned by the chances of a competitive examination. The present value of the exhibitions and results fees in these grades is as tempting as need be, yet they fail to attract more than a mere fraction of those who ought to be, and under different circumstances would be, presented for examination. A step likely to lead to useful results would be a modification by the Board of the definition of a school, contained in the Schedule to the Act of 1878, with a view to securing that no school which is not strictly secondary shall be able to obtain results fees. That such a change is within the competency of the Board would appear to be the meaning of section 6 (subsection 8) of the Act, which empowers the Board to "make rules for *prescribing* and satisfying themselves as to the observance of *the conditions upon which* managers of schools may receive payment of results fees," and also from the express exclusion of National schools from the definition in the Schedule. If this cannot be satisfactorily done, the end in view might be gained by withholding the whole, or a substantial portion, of the results fees gained in the lower grades, and making or completing the payment only when a boy had finished his intermediate course. The payment could be refused, or substantially reduced, if the pupil abandoned his secondary education without completing it, unless for some such legitimate cause as entering a University.

In the matter of inspection I am compelled, by the line taken by some of my correspondents, to disclaim all responsibility for any particular scheme in detail. The inspection of schools is an elastic process, and may mean anything, from the rigid examination of all pupils in every subject to the idea evidently present to the mind of the headmaster of an important public school who wrote to me: "I don't think it is absolutely necessary that we should have an elaborate system of examination. It would be very easy for a competent Board to decide what schools were being well conducted, and to distribute the endowments only over such schools." Any attempt at present to usurp the functions of the Commissioners by putting forward a complete scheme would be very injudicious, as it would necessarily divert discussion a good deal from the main issue to minor points. The question of supreme importance just now is whether we are to continue a system which has led to grave evil, or to consider it a public duty to seek some substitute for it. My chief reason for indicating the inspection and separate examination of the schools as the direction in which such substitute may be found is that it would guarantee efficiency, and would remove the cause of most of the existing mischief. If any sound plan can be produced

for retaining exhibitions and other honours for individual pupils in some form, it will deserve careful consideration, though I fail to see that it would be desirable unless it were confined to special departments of work—such as composition and translation at sight in the languages. The objections to inspection in any form put forward by some of the headmasters seem not very difficult to meet. A few appear to fear jobbery in the appointments; indeed, the head of a very distinguished school declares that “the Sub-Commissioners in the Land Courts would be paragons in comparison.” The possibility of such an evil would, I imagine, depend entirely on the principle of selection adopted, and it will be time enough for attack or defence of the Board when there is something more tangible to go upon than mere gratuitous suspicion. Some others are of opinion that a sufficient number of competent inspectors could not be found, but that obviously depends on what the inspectors are supposed to be competent to do. If the Commissioners were so foolish as to appoint a body of men to inspect the headmasters, it would be safe to predict prompt and decisive failure. We do not want our schools to be tampered with by theoretical faddists, nor do we desire to be made the victims of a wooden system of compromise. The duties of the inspectors should be definitely and rigidly confined to testing the proficiency of the pupils, and seeing that the schools are in every respect properly equipped for the work they undertake. For this purpose it would be easy enough to get competent men, and I may remark, in passing, that nobody would seriously propose that one inspector should examine a whole school in *all* its subjects. Amongst the advantages of inspection would be that it would embrace the whole school, while the present system scarcely reaches a third of the pupils. This would make it the direct interest of the headmaster to have equal attention paid to all his boys; indeed, I should, perhaps, rather say it would enable him and his assistants to devote themselves conscientiously to the whole school, instead of almost coercing them by large and tempting bribes into the preferential treatment of a small section. It would, moreover, make the arrangement of classes much more elastic, and allow boys to get their places in the school according to their proficiency, rather than, as at present, in the narrowest sense, according to their age. Nobody who has not had experience of the present system can realise the full extent of these benefits. In the payment of results fees also it would bring about a change which is desired with practical unanimity by the headmasters, the payment of moderate fees for all, or nearly all the pupils, instead of the extravagant sums now paid for a few. The present system of results fees is perhaps the best the Board could devise under the present system of examination, but, to one unacquainted with the reasons for it, it would seem absurd and incredible. Knowing that not more than a fraction of the pupils of a school will gain results fees, the Board,

earnestly striving to make the money reach the schools, has made the fees for the few ridiculously high. If it be considered desirable to compare schools with one another, so as to estimate their relative excellence, inspection would enable the comparison to be based on the whole work of the school in every department, and the manager would no longer feel that the reputation of the institution for which he is responsible depends on the number of exhibitioners he can induce or bribe to patronise it. It is intelligible that some schools should shrink from inspection; but that the public, whose interests are at stake, should hesitate to demand it and insist upon having it pass comprehension.

A number of points in my former article which have been received with warm approval by many of my correspondents, and tacitly admitted by nearly all the rest, constitute of themselves so grave an indictment of the intermediate system that I may be permitted to briefly recall them. "The examiners are, almost exclusively, men who have never taught in intermediate schools, and they are invariably changed after a year or two, lest, one would imagine, experience might fit them for their positions." It is to be feared that legitimate criticism of the examiners does not end here, but, like most of the evils of this unhappy system, the trouble is inherent, and could be got rid of only by a total change. The worthlessness of these examinations as a public test of the schools is shown by the fact that "in 1895, of the 24,271 pupils of intermediate schools, those about whom satisfactory information was given to the public were less than 5000, about a fifth of the whole." The actual figures for three years were:

1895	4973
1896	4966
1897	5538

But, lest the utter inadequacy of the test should not be misleading enough, "the newspapers unfortunately think they are performing an important public duty by tabulating the schools according to the number of exhibitions and prizes won by each, with the result that the public judge the schools by no other standard. The inevitable consequence is that managers are driven to most unbecoming efforts to get into their schools a few students of sufficient brilliancy to secure them a good place in the all-important table." Further points which I have reason to regard as generally admitted are that the pass standard is unreasonably high, owing chiefly to the fact that "the same brief paper is set to test at once the gold medallist in a subject and the mere pass candidate"; also that "the intermediate system requires a great deal of subdivision of classes and special grinding of individuals, which largely increase the expense of working a school." I might add that the age limits lead to further complications, which tell injuriously on the pupils. Certainly not the least important of the points that may be regarded as scarcely

open to question is the physical evil that comes from the over-pressure. "Nobody will venture to assert in cold blood that it is desirable to subject the physical and mental health and development of boys, year after year from the age of twelve to eighteen, to the terrible strain of an unbroken grind, similar in character, and, for them, not less severe than that for a stiff Civil Service competition. Yet this is just what takes place." I have to thank a correspondent who most kindly directed my attention to the views of an eminent authority on this point.

Dr. Clouston says, in his book on mental diseases:¹ "I cannot help here adverting to some absurd and unphysiological theories of education which are common, and which we, as medical men, should combat with all our might. The theory of any education worth the name should be to bring the whole organism to such perfection as it is capable of, and to train the brain power in accordance with its capacity, most carefully avoiding any overstraining of weak points—and an apparently strong point in the brain capacity of a young child may in reality be its weakest point in after life. . . . If there is anything which a careful study of the higher laws of physiology in regard to brain development and heredity is fitted to teach us, it is this, that the forcing-house treatment of the intellectual and receptive parts of the brain, if it is carried to such an extent as to stunt the trophic centres and the centres of organic appetite and muscular motion, is an unmixed evil to the individual, and still more so to the race. There is no time or place of organic repentance provided by nature for the sins of the schoolmaster."

The great difficulty which usually blocks the path of reform in matters such as this is the *vis inertiae*. So many are rendered easy-going and submissive through disinclination for effort; they cannot, or will not, see that each individual is an integral part of the public, and has his own definite duty to perform when a system which is hurtful to the general good demands a remedy. Conservatism, too, though excellent in principle, readily degenerates into a nerveless cowardice, and palsies action, even when the *fainéant* knows his policy is little better than the conservation of evil. But, relying on the enlightened policy uniformly adopted by the Board as far as they have been allowed by the mistaken line into which they were driven by the Act of 1878, we may hope that they at least will have the courage to take such steps as may be necessary to restore to our secondary education that true scholarship the loss of which Professor Mahaffy deplures, by giving us back that freedom for higher training which existed in the old days, described by an experienced and distinguished headmaster as :

τὸ πρὶν ἐπ' εἰρήνης, πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ὕλας Ἀχαιῶν.

while providing such a stimulus to general activity in the schools as was sadly wanted in those days. . . . ANDREW MURPHY.

¹ Clouston on *Mental Diseases*, p. 533.

PICKETING.

TRULY the fallacies of protectionism bear a charmed life. No sooner has England freed herself from their powerful influence in the higher walks of industry than their poison finds an even more dangerous vantage-ground in the ranks of the labourer and the artisan.

In fact, as formerly a futile trust in legal protection diverted men's attention from practical work, so now the labour leaders are ever ready to depend rather on force and law than on the justice of their cause and the spontaneous recognition by their followers of the value of their policy.

The tyranny that results from this tendency in the labour world is perhaps hardly realised as it should be. It is scarcely conceivable that Englishmen, so sensitive to all that concerns personal liberty as they generally are, would tolerate the continuance of the present position one moment longer than was inevitable did they fully understand the cruelty that is going on under the name of "picketing"—a position in which, under the pretence of a harmless permission to obtain and give information, intimidation is legally protected and the just punishment of outrage is rendered impossible.

There can be no difficulty in showing that this description of the actual results of picketing is literally true. Notwithstanding the number of cases that never come into court owing to terrorism, or fail from want of evidence, quite enough instances of trades-union violence are reported to prevent any possibility of doubt on the subject.

Thus, for example, there can be no mistake as to the meaning of such a case as that of *Bailey v. Pye*, tried before Mr. Baron Pollock at the beginning of last year.

The evidence on this occasion proved that, owing to the payment of a time-expired apprentice as under-foreman by the hour instead of by the piece, a dispute arose in a glass silvering and bevelling factory, and some of the men employed came out on strike. One of those who remained did not join in the quarrel, and finished some of the uncompleted work. On this account he was threatened by one of the strikers. He took out a summons for intimidation; but before the hearing six men set upon him, and so severely handled him that he was left insensible. The outrage succeeded in its aim, for the man was too terrified to appear, and the summons was dismissed.

Naturally the employers would not wish under any circumstances to take a man such as the accused into their service again, and conscious of this the men's trade-union now added to their other demands the claim that if a settlement were arranged no exception should be made in this particular man's case. The dispute went on and the factory was picketed.

This meant that the works and all their approaches were systematically watched by a number of trades-unionists told off for the purpose. Every one who went in or out was followed. Other shops were communicated with to prevent goods bought from the firm being finished for it, and so threatening was the crowd that the few men who remained at the factory were compelled to sleep on the premises. Police evidence was given that special protection had to be afforded in several instances. It was said that the employer's brougham on one occasion was followed by a crowd of people numbering according to its occupant three hundred to four hundred persons; according to the police about thirty to forty men. Whatever the truth may be as to details, there was no dispute as to the dangerous character of the mob, and that it only dispersed on the arrival of the authorities. During the dispute two of the strikers died. Their deaths had nothing to do with the struggle; but, though the route to the cemetery lay quite away from the factory, the funerals were led past it. In one case the mourners gave vent to their feelings by arranging for the performance of the Dead March in *Saul* at that particular place.

Here surely we have unmistakably present all the worst features that make social anarchy. We have a private association setting itself up to organise threatening crowds in order to gain special objects of its own. We have indirect, if not direct, encouragement and protection given to the dastardly outrage that happened so opportunely to give weight to the trade-union demands. We have men guilty of no known crime held up to the hatred and obloquy of those whose necessity makes them peculiarly ripe for acts of violence.

It is not as though this were an exceptional instance of trades-union picketing. There is not a labour dispute of any dimensions that does not give rise to a repetition of the same incidents over and over again. So frequent, indeed, are they that it is a wonder that any large number of the working-class are still found openly opposing themselves to the commands of the more widespread societies, especially when we consider the subtle influence of outrage, the great temptation to men dependent on their manual labour to bear with wrongs rather than run the risk of wasting time in prosecuting other workmen, and the terror that shouting men, cursing women, and spiteful children encouraged to mischief by those who should control them, are able to inspire.

The great engineering dispute that has just ended is rich in pregnant instances bearing on the subject before us. From all parts of the country, from Birmingham, from Sheffield, from Leeds, from Newcastle-on-Tyne, from Gloucester, from Chelmsford, we hear of trades-union pickets, accompanied by howling, booing, stone and dirt-throwing mobs, following so-called blacklegs to and from the factories at which they were engaged. From Sheffield, where the official trades-unionists have bitterly complained because police protection has been given to free labourers seeking work there, we read of an engineer from London, on his way to John Brown & Co.'s armour-plate manufactory, being set upon by a number of men, and only rescued by the police after receiving terrible injuries. From Chelmsford an account comes of a bridal party surrounded by a crowd on their way from church, hailed with cries of "blacklegs" and "dirty dogs," pelted with flour, eggs, and soaked bread, and driven at length to take shelter in a public-house. From Swansea a case is reported of a man almost cut in half with a piece of wire-rope by two men who attacked him simply on the ground of his being a blackleg.

It may be said that it is not fair to hold trades-unionism responsible for every folly that ignorant men, exasperated by starvation and injustice, may commit. And such a plea might perhaps deserve some weight, were it not that official trades-unionism everywhere identifies itself, as in the case of *Bailey v. Pye*, with all crimes arising in any way out of picketing. It is trades-unions that pay the fines and law costs of defendants in such cases, that support their wives and children whilst they are in prison, that receive them on their release with admiring addresses and congratulatory banquets, and that employ every possible means to obtain the mitigation of their sentences. It is the chief trades-union leaders also who, far from pointing out that men who take work refused by others are after all only acting within their right, are foremost in holding up any one who may refuse to accept trades-union dictation, not merely as a traitor to be shunned, but as necessarily inferior both in intellect and character. It is they also who take the lead in agitating for such an extension of legal picketing as may make society membership the only practicable road to employment.

It may further be urged that even if picketing has objectionable features, nothing human is perfect, and the law is strong enough to punish effectively those who exceed its limits.

In theory this argument undoubtedly has a very plausible sound, but it is obvious that, in practice, its force must be entirely dependent on circumstances. As matters stand at present, the mere fact that those who control trades-union policy are allowed, free from all danger of legal penalty, to place their followers in positions where it is nothing but common sense to expect crime to result, introduces an element of uncertainty into any legal proceedings that must greatly

tend to vitiate their value as protective agencies. It is no satisfaction to a man crippled for life to know that if he takes a very great amount of trouble there is a remote chance that the person who has injured him may have to suffer too; whilst it is certain that juries will always be reluctant to convict the miserable agent as long as the more guilty principal is able to go scot free.

In truth the present position is intolerable whether we define the legitimate aim of trades-unionism to be to make the workman equal to the employer, or to place him in a position of supremacy.

Taking the first supposition, in commercial bargains, self-interest is clearly a more suitable weapon for obtaining true justice than force; and, though the power to wait conferred by capital does undoubtedly give an unfair advantage to its possessor in his negotiations with the weekly wage earner, all that the latter can fairly ask is the right freely to form and control reserve funds for the support of any workman who, with the assent of his society, refuses to accept work offered to him.

Should, however, the second supposition be considered that which should rule in our labour legislation, then it is clear that the legal arrangements to give it effect should not be left to the chances of a subterfuge, but that the full right of the labour leaders to enforce membership in and submission to trades-unions should be recognised, so that their actions may be brought within the shackles of acknowledged responsibility.

It is an undeniable fact that the latter is the alternative that finds growing favour amongst the advanced trades-unionists of the present day; and this in spite of the peculiar directness with which all English experience points to the unmistakable advantages of a free trade policy in every form of commerce.

And as if to make this fact still more remarkable, it is the very men who are loudest in their cry that the manual labourer alone among the workers of England is unfit to take care of himself in the simple matter of the sale of his skill, who at the same time are most persistent in their iteration of their perfect trust in his judgment, their admiration for his ability, their unrestricted appreciation of his worth, and their unique acquaintance with his needs.

These are apparent contradictions in themselves sufficient to raise doubts as to the validity of the claims to represent the better reason of the working classes of these advocates in labour matters of force and yet more force.

It would surely be more in accordance with probabilities to believe that the working classes are misrepresented by the voices that thus pretend to speak in their name than that they really of their own free will desire the systematic coercion of their own order, their regimenting in bands yielding obedience not to the most able craftsmen but to the best fighters amongst them, their constant

subjection to all the galling restrictions on individual liberty more appropriate to a destructive soldier than to a productive artisan, all of which are necessarily involved if warfare between labour and capital is rightly the natural and proper aim of trades-unionism.

Truly, if any one might be expected to realise more clearly than another that passionate antagonism between himself and his employer can only end in disaster, that it is in organised unity not in organised opposition that his real welfare must be sought, it is the man habituated to support himself by manual labour. As in the individual the hand must submit to the brain, so if handicraft is hostile to braincraft the only possible end must be defeat with all the cruelties that inevitably result to the defeated.

How, then, is it possible to account for the arbitrary hatred of the employers that unquestionably is uppermost in official trades-unionism, except on the assumption that the free expression of working class opinion is by some cause outside ordinary commercial considerations restricted within undue limits?

Such a cause, it is obvious, would be the legal right of picketing if it, as it has been endeavoured to be shown in these lines it actually does, merely means the opportunity of bringing society intimidation to bear free from any equivalent responsibility for the results.

The power of organised cliques to impose their will on others is well known to be quite out of proportion to their numbers or their merits. There is no class in the community that might not be terrorised by an unscrupulous minority if the right sense of the remaining classes did not come to the aid of the majority. The liberty of the poor is specially in need of protection. Historical teaching is full of lessons on the duty of governments to guard against the setting up of despotisms within the inner circle of the State.

Already the isolated worker and the weaker trades union hold their independence on a very precarious tenure. Already the increasingly arbitrary claims of New Unionism constitute a very real social danger. The present position is bad, but it may easily be made worse if our legislators, unaware of its true significance, should allow some further concession to be made such as may place the free labourer finally at the mercy of the irresponsible labour leader, and may leave to the working classes as a whole no means of remedying any grievances they may suffer from but such as may fit in with the schemes of official trades-unionism or the yet more unproved and fallacious plans of any revolutionary Socialist who may succeed in capturing the trades-union machinery.

JUDICIAL SEX BIAS.

II.

IN previous articles it has been shown that the Act which secured the municipal vote to women in 1869 was an act of *restitution*; that in earlier periods of our history duly qualified women voted in local matters, and even for members of Parliament; and that the municipal franchise was beyond question sometimes exercised by duly qualified married women. At the present time it is the usual practice of revising barristers to strike the names of married women off the municipal register should attention be called to the fact of marriage. This is, at any rate, the case in England and Wales, *although* in Scotland qualified married women may vote without let or hindrance for municipal and county council elections. How comes this inequality of condition and treatment? Immediately upon the act of restitution of 1869 many thousands of women voted in the subsequent November municipal elections. No doubt for the most part these women were unmarried women or widows, because, so long as the law imposed upon England by its Norman conquerors remained in force, a law which made a woman's marriage the forfeiture of all her property and property rights, and merged her civil existence in that of her husband, it was obvious that only under special circumstances could married women acquire or hold the necessary qualification for the franchise, so long as these were dependent upon ratepaying or the possession of property.

In November 1871, two years after the restitution of women's municipal rights, a contested election was held in the Sunderland ward of the borough of Sunderland. One of the candidates was returned by a majority of one only. From the nature of the case an inquiry was immediately made as to what doubtful votes could be taken exception to. The votes of two women were finally selected. One of these women was married, but living apart from her husband and paying rates and taxes in her own name; the other instance was that of a woman placed on the register when single, but who had married nine days before the election. In January 1872, the ensuing case *Regina v. Harrald* was heard in the Court of Queen's Bench before Lord Chief Justice Cockburn. For the married women, counsel (Mr. Charles Crompton, Q.C.) argued that women were capable of voting,

and did actually vote, that no exceptions were made by any statute as to married women, and that "coverture," being no longer a bar to the holding of property, ought not to be a bar to the enjoyment of such incidents of property as the various franchises dependent upon its possession. On the other side, it was argued by Mr. Herschell, Q.C. (now Lord Herschell, ex-Lord Chancellor), that a married woman was not, in the eyes of the law, "a person." She was not *sui juris*. The Lord Chief Justice accepted and sustained this view of the law. The two votes were disallowed and the councillor unseated. It should be remembered, however, that the Married Women's Property Act, 1870, did not, as did the later Married Women's Property Act of 1882, confer upon a married woman the rights of contracting and of suing and being sued, rights essential to full legal responsibility in matters of property, but simply gave her the right to the use and disposal of her own earnings, earned apart from her husband, and to the use and disposal of certain investments of them. So that there was at the time some slight excuse for Lord Chief Justice Cockburn's attitude, although it was distinctly a *retrogression* from the older and juster practice.

Since that time, however, the Married Women's Property Act of 1882 has given to married women these fuller property rights and imposed thereby upon them fuller legal responsibility. Yet as a consequence of this decision in 1871, on the part of the Lord Chief Justice, married women are still usually struck off municipal registers by revising barristers when their status of marriage is indicated. Usually, though not uniformly, for some revising barristers draw the line at one of the cases, and admit the right to vote of a married woman living apart from her husband; a condition which was, moreover, for some years prior to 1891, essential to a married woman's right to vote in local matters in Scotland. It has been further *assumed* that the same limitation applied to married women with regard to the right to vote for a county council. Yet no case affecting the voting rights of married women has ever been brought before the courts since the passing of the Married Women's Property Act of 1882, and it is the opinion of some legal authorities of the highest eminence that married women who possess the needful qualifications are now entitled as a consequence of that Act to their full franchises in municipal and county council matters. The position is ridiculously inconsistent, inasmuch as qualified married women may, and now actually do, vote in all elections conducted under the Local Government Acts of 1894. After the defeat of the late Liberal Government, in November 1893, on Mr. M'Laren's instruction, which provided "That it be an instruction to the Committee that they have power to insert provisions to enfranchise for the purposes of this Act all those women, whether married or single, who would be entitled to be on the Local Government

register of electors, or on the parliamentary register of electors, if they were men," Mr. Fowler, who had charge of the Local Government (England and Wales) Bill, promised, on behalf of the Government, that they would take steps practically to set aside the decision in the case of *Regina v. Harrold*, so as to secure the enfranchisement of qualified married women for all purposes of local, municipal, and county council voting. This pledge has only been fulfilled in its entirety with regard to Scotland. It still remains unredeemed so far as concerns the municipal and county council vote of married women throughout England and Wales.

In this connection it may be worth while to call attention to a fresh aggression at this moment being made upon one of the most ancient and apparently assured rights of women. Dr. Jessopp, in an interesting article, "Parish Life before the Great Pillage," to be found in the January number of the *Nineteenth Century*, tells us that the parish was the community of the township, organised for Church purposes and subject to Church discipline, "with a constitution which recognised the rights of the whole body as an aggregate, and the right of every adult member, *whether man or woman*, to a voice in self-government." The vestry meeting was, in fact, open to every parishioner, and every parishioner, man or woman, even the very humblest, had the same voting rights as the squire of the parish. At the annual vestry meeting much business other than ecclesiastical was considered. The legislation of 1894 dissociated from the ancient parish vestry meeting all business not purely ecclesiastical; civil business being handed over to the newly-constituted Parish Councils, or, where these do not exist, to the annual parish meeting. It should be carefully remembered that in these old vestries there was no distinction whatever of sex; that women could vote in vestries, could serve as churchwardens, and could take part in all parochial matters on just the same terms as men. Since the transfer of the non-ecclesiastical part of the vestry work, it has been proposed that there shall be in each parish for ecclesiastical business a Church Council, and the bishops in the Upper House of Convocation have decided, by a majority of two, that no women are to be elected on these Church Councils. They have decreed that "male communicants of full age" are alone eligible. Churchwardens are to be members *ex officio*. It will be curious to note how the difficulty will be dealt with, raised by the fact that there are at present several, if not many, women churchwardens.

The first limitation of women's rights in Church matters was imposed by the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874, which refused to consider the aggrieved consciences of women, and confined the right of seeking redress for any grievance to "male persons" only. In the meeting of Convocation now referred to, five bishops voted for the inclusion of women and seven against. One bishop

(the Bishop of Norwich) went so far as to propose that "Young fellows of nineteen should be given a vote, because they liked to vote." When the Bishop of Lichfield was appealed to afterwards by a representation of what a retrograde step he was inviting the Church to take, he replied that women were not, in his opinion, to "govern" in the Church, though they might "minister" to it. The absurdity of this position is manifest enough when it is remembered that these very bishops hold their episcopal office not simply by virtue of the *congé d'élire* and its sequel, but by the appointment of the Sovereign, the Head of the Church, herself a woman. Yet women are not "to govern in the Church!" This matter is of moment, as indicating the force of the reactionary wave of 1897, the "year of shame," which, it is to be hoped, is now nearly spent. This insult to women communicants, members of the Church, patronesses of livings, and to the Sovereign herself, can scarcely be passed over without serious remonstrance. The absurdity of all these limitations and narrowings of the position of women is the more striking since the worst forms of it have been brought into play under the reign of a woman who for sixty years has filled the highest public function in the State: first, for three years as a maiden, then for twenty-one years as a wife, marriage in her case making no difference whatever in her legal status, and now for thirty-six years as a widow. Why should the rights of any persons under her rule be limited or destroyed on the ground of sex or marriage?

We now come to deal with the underlying basis of all these injustices towards women, and here again we have to complain of legal wrong due to judicial sex bias. At the National Congress of Mothers, held at Washington, U.S.A., in February 1897 (an immense gathering of women delegates from all parts of the United States), an address on "The Moral Responsibility of Women in Heredity" was delivered by Mrs. Helen H. Gardener, from which I extract the following:

"The condemned man, upon whom the death-watch has been set, who cannot hope for executive clemency, who is helpless in the hands of absolute power, still knows that, although death may be sure, physical suffering is unlikely, or, at the worst, will be but brief; but he alone stands in the position to know, even to a degree, the nervous strain, the mental anguish, the unthinking but uncontrollable panics of flesh and blood and nerve which woman faces at the behests of love and maternity and, alas that it can be true! at the behests of sex-power, and of financial dependence! . . .

"But when we study anthropology and heredity . . . we begin to wonder that man has been so slow in learning to read the message that nature has telegraphed to him in letters of fire, and photographed with a terrible persistency upon the distorted, diseased bodies and minds of his children, and upon the moral imbeciles she has set before him as an answer to his message of sex domination. Do you know that there is an army of seven hundred thousand defectives in this country? Don't you know that this means something to every mother in the world? Seven hundred thousand forced into life without their birthright! Seven hundred thousand imbe-

cile, insane, deaf, dumb, blind, and criminal victims of maternal and paternal ignorance! Stop and think of it. There are but three cities in America which have seven hundred thousand inhabitants. Our standing army is only about twenty-five thousand men—these for our protection; our defective army seven hundred thousand—these for our destruction!

“Self-abnegation, subserviency to man, whether he be father, lover, or husband, is the most dangerous theory that can be taught to or forced upon her whose character shall mould the next generation.”

Yet this utter subserviency to the husband is actually enforced upon English women at the present hour by a brutal, unjust, man-made, judge-made law. Mr. John Stuart Mill, in *The Subjection of Women*, published in 1869, declared (p. 57):

“The wife: however brutal a tyrant she may unfortunately be chained to—though she may know that he hates her, though it may be his daily pleasure to torture her, and though she may feel it impossible not to loathe him, he can claim from her and enforce the lowest degradation of a human being—that of being made the instrument of an animal function contrary to her inclinations.”

Some of us thought at the time that Mr. Mill's statement of the law was too *strong*, the belief of many of us being that so extreme a view of the legal powers of an English husband could not be sustained, this being also the view of some lawyers of eminence. Mrs. Wolstenholme Elmy, in a paper read before the Dialectical Society, March 3, 1880, spoke as follows:

“I come now to a point upon which I have to beg your kind indulgence and your most candid and thoughtful consideration, since it is one upon which it is difficult for a woman to speak without giving offence, and impossible for her to speak at all without expressing strong feeling. Mr. Courtney Kenny, in his *History of the Law of Married Women's Property*, calls attention to ‘a doctrine whose inhumanity has often provoked hostile criticism from law reformers, and whose legal validity has lately been challenged by Sir James Stephen’ (Mr. Justice Stephen). ”

“The doctrine, as stated in the words of Judge Hale himself, upon whose solitary dictum alone it rests, is this: ‘The husband cannot be guilty of a rape committed by himself upon his lawful wife, for by *their mutual matrimonial consent and contract* the wife hath given herself up in this kind unto her husband, which she *cannot* retract.’ ”

“Sir James Stephen's comment upon this is: ‘Hale's reason is that the wife's consent at marriage is irrevocable. Surely, however, the consent is confined to the decent and proper use of marital rights. If a man used violence to his wife under circumstances in which decency or her own health or safety required or justified her in refusing her consent, I think he might be convicted of rape, notwithstanding Lord Hale's dictum.’ ”

“This doctrine, resting solely on the unsupported dictum of a single judge, it is now sought to embody in the Statute Law of England; for section 200 of the Criminal Code Bill, 1880, thus defines rape: ‘Rape is

¹ Judge Hale's dictum, referred to by Mr. Justice Stephen, is one of the numerous *obiter dicta* of sex-biased judges, from the consequences of which women have suffered so cruelly. The case under his consideration was that of a husband who had used violence towards his wife in order to assist another person to commit a rape upon her. This was adjudged a felonious act. The dictum of Judge Hale was therefore quite beside the matter under consideration, and according to Mr. Justice Stephen in his *Digest of the Criminal Law*, “he gives no authority for it.”

the act of a man, not under the age of fourteen years, having carnal knowledge of a woman, *who is not his wife*, without her consent.' That there may be no mistake as to the intent and legal effect of these words, I would refer you to the Draft Bill of 1878, section 165, which reads: 'Provided that a husband cannot commit rape upon his wife by carnally knowing her himself.' I submit that rape, being a violation of a primary natural right, is, and ought to be by law declared to be, wholly independent of any legal or other artificially created relationship between the parties, and that it would be a gross immorality to enact, as the section I have just quoted proposes implicitly to do, that any such act by a husband, however base and cruel it may be, is justified by the matrimonial consent of the wife once given and never to be retracted.

"And to this infamy, this 'degradation,' to quote the words of a distinguished French jurist, 'which neither the most savage races nor the lowest animals have ever known,' it is proposed to give a place on the statute-book of this free country. . . .

"It can never have been the purpose of the promoters of the Code, by a casual and unexplained phrase in a Bill comprising some hundreds of sections, to degrade every English wife to the legal position of the purchased slave of the harem, and to reduce her to a bodily slavery to which earth offers no other parallel. I believe, therefore, that when once the nature and effect of this provision is understood, as I hope you will make it understood, it can never become the law of this land."

The Criminal Code Bill did *not* become law; nevertheless it can no longer be doubted that at the present moment the law of England as to the relations of wife and husband is, in this matter, precisely what was stated by Mr. John Stuart Mill. This has been effected, not by legislation, but by the *declaration of the judges*, made in the case *Regina v. Clarence*, heard in the Court of Crown Cases Reserved, November 10, 1888, before Lord Chief Justice Coleridge, Baron Pollock, Baron Huddleston, and Justices Manisty, Stephen, Mathew, Smith, Wills, Grantham, Field, Hawkins, Day, and Charles. The case was one stated by the Recorder of London. The prisoner Clarence was charged, in one count, with unlawfully and maliciously inflicting grievous bodily harm upon his wife, Selina Clarence; and, in another count, with assaulting her, occasioning actual bodily harm. The evidence showed that the prisoner was aware of his suffering at the time from disease, and that she was not aware of it. The jury found the prisoner guilty on both counts. For the prisoner it was urged, in the Court of Crown Cases Reserved, that the conviction was contrary to the authorities, whilst for the prosecution other authorities were cited on the other side. It was finally held by the majority of the judges, Justices Field, Hawkins, Day, and Charles dissenting, that the conviction under either section could not be supported. The conviction was therefore quashed. Those who wish to understand in its full degradation the actual character of the law of England at the present time respecting the relation of marriage ought to study this case with the greatest care.' Its bearing, however, upon the marriage relation is not to be

¹ A full report of the case is to be found in *The Justice of the Peace*, March 9, 1889.

measured by the actual decision, but by the statements of the several judges, in which *all of them implicitly concurred*, as to the legal position of a husband in relation to a wife.

Mr. Justice Smith affirms: "At marriage the wife consents to the husband's exercising the marital right. The consent then given is not confined to a husband when sane in body, for I suppose no one would assert that a husband was guilty of an offence because he exercised such right when afflicted with some complaint of which he was then ignorant. Until the consent given at marriage be revoked, how can it be said that the husband, in exercising his marital right, has assaulted the wife?"

Mr. Justice Stephen, at the end of a very lengthy argument, says: "I wish to observe, on a matter personal to myself, that I was quoted as having said, in my *Digest of the Criminal Law*, that I thought a husband might, under certain circumstances, be indicted for rape on his wife. I did say so in the first edition, but, on referring to the last edition, p. 121 (note), it will be found that that statement was withdrawn."

Baron Pollock, also in the course of a lengthy argument, declares: "The husband's connection with his wife is not only lawful, but it is in accordance with the ordinary condition of married life. It is done in pursuance of the marital contract, and of the status which was created by marriage, and the wife, as to the connection itself, is in a different position from any other woman, *for she has no right or power to refuse her consent*. As is said by Lord Hale, in his *Pleas of the Crown*, p. 629: 'By their mutual matrimonial consent and contract, the wife hath given up herself in this kind unto her husband, which she cannot retract.' Such a connection may be accompanied with conduct which amounts to cruelty, as where the condition of the wife is such that she will or may suffer from such connection; or, as here, where the condition of the husband is such that the wife will suffer."¹

Such, then, is the law of England with relation to the married woman. Anything more infamously degrading it is impossible to conceive. Does the English girl know, when a man asks her in marriage, that he asks her to become for life, not merely his unpaid household servant, but his sexual slave? No decent man, realising this, could ever by possibility ask a woman to marry him, nor would any woman in her senses accept such a proposition. But throughout the whole of society there is a conspiracy of silence. The civil ceremony, which constitutes a perfectly legal marriage, gives no hint of this bodily subjection and slavery, nor does the young girl imagine when, in an ecclesiastical ceremony, she promises "to obey,"

¹ Wilful communication of venereal disease by a husband to a wife constitutes such "legal" cruelty as entitles her to a judicial separation, and, as evidence of adultery, probably to a divorce.

that she gives "up herself in this kind unto her husband, which she cannot retract." Need we wonder at the existing condition of the world? No human creature has ever yet been born fit to exercise over another human creature the power which the English law gives to the English husband over the English wife. If all men were indeed such brutes as the actual law implies them to be, a violent revolution long ere this would have taken place. Happily the majority of men are better than the law; and to many a man it will be as abhorrent as to any woman that he should be by the law placed in the so terrible position of an unwilling tyrant. Yet there are base men who abuse to the utmost the power which the law gives them. Those who are continually called upon to advise and assist wives suffering under the most shameful treatment, know well that the decent veil of legal marriage too often covers horrors not to be expressed. Of these it is impossible to speak here.

The only amelioration of the outrageous infamy of this law of marriage is the fact that, by the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1884, an end was put to the punishment by imprisonment of the husband or wife who refused to obey a decree of the Court for the restitution of conjugal rights. That this power of imprisonment was not a mere *brutum fulmen*, but a terrible reality in former days, may be learned from a Suffolk case, early in the present century. A wife in contempt of court, a lady of good family in Suffolk, was imprisoned in Ipswich gaol for disobeying a decree requiring her to render conjugal rights to her husband. At the end of a year and ten months she became in want of the common necessities of life, and was reduced to the gaol allowance of bread and water; she suffered from rheumatism and other maladies, which were aggravated by the miseries of her imprisonment; and, after many years of such suffering, died in prison—for she never went back to her husband.

But, even in this case of the suit for the restitution of conjugal rights, although it had been repeatedly condemned by the very judges whose duty it was to administer it, Sir James Hannen having said "he did not wonder at any one assisting a woman to resist the monstrous jurisdiction which existed in this country only, and which he wished did not exist here—namely, the power of committing a woman because she does not return to her husband, whom she does not wish to live with"; it was not on the ground of the injustice to women at all, but on the occasion of the application of the suit to a man, that the measure was introduced by which this degree of relief was given. Mrs. Georgina Weldon obtained a decree against her husband for restitution of conjugal rights, and sought to have practical effect given to it. Immediately the Matrimonial Causes Bill, 1884, was brought forward, and passed rapidly through Parliament, establishing the needful immunity.

Under the decision in the *Clitheroe* case, moreover, heard in April

1891, a wife who refuses to live with her husband can neither be seized by him or by his authority, nor will she be imprisoned by any court. But, so long as a wife continues to live under the roof of her husband, the law, as stated above, takes effect in all its brutality.

Yet, as Helen H. Gardener points out :

"Subject mothers never did, and subject mothers never will, produce a race of free, well-poised, liberty-loving, justice-practising children. Maternity is an awful power. It blindly strikes back at injustice with a force that is a fearful menace to mankind. And the race which is born of mothers who are harassed, bullied, subordinated, or made the victims of blind passion or power, or of mothers who are simply too petty and self-debased to feel their subject status, cannot fail to continue to give the horrible spectacles we have always had of war, of crime, of vice, of trickery, of double-dealing, of pretence, of lying, of arrogance, of subserviency, of incompetence, of brutality, and, alas! of insanity, idiocy, and disease added to a fearful and unnecessary mortality."

And further :

"Social, educational, and economic conditions have all conspired to keep mothers ignorant of all the facts of life of which mothers should know everything; and so it has come about that the race is the victim of the narrow and dangerous doctrine of sex domination and sex restriction, and of selfish, reckless indulgence and ignorant maternity."

Is it not time to begin at the beginning and to reform the law of the association of the sexes? Never until then can we have a free, a just, a humane people.

An enforced maternity is a crime against the higher humanity and a crime against the race. The wife who bears the burden of maternity should be a free, purposeful, loving mother, and not a subject slave.

Again, in Helen Gardener's words :

"With the present knowledge of heredity, with woman's enlarged opportunity and broadened education, she who permits herself to become a mother without having first demanded and obtained her own freedom from sex domination and fair conditions of development for herself and child, will commit a crime against herself, against her child, and against mankind."

Will not men also bestir themselves to remove this ignominy from their sex and this shameful wrong from ours? Every woman in the land is degraded by such a condition of the law. No wonder that men who have made and maintain these laws regarding women in marriage hold them unfit for any civil rights whatsoever, incapable, incompetent—and such men have done their best to make them so.

Believing, as does the present writer, with Mr. John Stuart Mill, that "the moral regeneration of mankind will only really commence when the most fundamental of the social relations is placed under the rule of equal justice," I urge this duty as the prime duty on every

lover of justice. I appeal to every man who reveres his mother or respects his wife, to every woman who respects herself, to aid in bringing about as soon as possible this essential condition of the higher progress of the race. To accomplish this in the speediest and surest manner, the first thing necessary is to secure for women that political enfranchisement which will enable them to compel attention to their most just and urgent claims and needs.

IGNOTA.

DOGS IN POETRY.

PERHAPS there is no animal whose nature, character, and disposition have been more differently regarded in different countries, or even at different times in the same country, than the dog's.

Some animals have handed down the same attributes from generation to generation, and have borne the same reputation from the earliest recorded era down to the present day.

In what age or country, for instance, has the *fox* been regarded as anything but the personification of thievery and cunning. The Fables of Æsop, the Idylls of Theocritus, and the Song of Solomon alike speak of "the little foxes" as the foes of the vines; and the modern farmer would use the same language to-day with respect to his poultry yard.

Now we English people have a very high opinion of the dog, and give it a foremost, if not *the* foremost, place amongst animals for intelligence, fidelity and affection.

But the ancients regarded it in a very different light.¹ Homer used the animal as typical of shamelessness; his most scornful epithet in the *Iliad* is *κυνῶπις* (*kunopis*) or dog-faced.

It must be admitted, however, that he has one beautiful passage in which he does ample justice to the dog's faithfulness. I refer, of course, to the splendid passage at the close of the *Odyssey*, where the hero comes home after twenty years' wanderings by sea and land and is recognised by his faithful dog Argus:²

"Thus near the gates conferring as they drew,
Argus the dog his ancient master knew;
And not unconscious of the voice and tread,
Lifts to the sound his ear, and rears his head.

* * * *

"Now left to man's ingratitude he lay,
Unhoused, neglected in the public way:
He knew his lord,—he knew and strove to meet;
In vain he strove to crawl and kiss his feet;

•

¹ Cerberus, a canine monster with three heads, was the reputed guardian of Hades; a low class of philosophers were branded as cynics (*κυνικοί*).

² Professor Ruskin has a very strange remark anent this incident; he says: "My pleasure in the entire *Odyssey* is diminished because Ulysses gives not a word of kindness nor of regret to Argus." But surely we might have inferred for ourselves (even if we were not expressly told that the hero turned aside to hide his emotion from Eumæus) that Odysseus had a part to play, and must not disclose his identity till he had settled with Penelope's suitors.

Yet (all he could) his tail, his ears, his eyes,
Salute his master, and confess his joys.
Soft pity touched the mighty master's soul,
A down his cheek a tear unbidden stole.

* * * *

"The dog whom Fate had granted to behold
His lord, when twenty tedious years had rolled,
Takes a last look, and, having seen him, dies;—
So closed for ever faithful Argus' eyes."

From POPE's translation of Hom. *Od.* xvii.

The dog is nowhere mentioned in the whole Bible from beginning to end save in terms of abhorrence and disgust.¹

This is of course largely due to the fact that it was regarded as an unclean animal by the Jews—a mere scavenger, like the pariah dogs in Eastern cities to-day.

The giant Goliath says to the youthful David, "Am I a dog that thou comest to me with staves?"

Hazael asks, "Is thy servant a dog that he should do this great thing?"

Abner uses the still stronger form of interrogation, "Am I a dog's head?"

Jezebel's fearful end was foretold in the words: "In the portion of Jezreel shall dogs eat the flesh of Jezebel"; and after her husband had met his righteous doom we read that "the dogs licked up Ahab's blood." Even the price received for a dog was not accepted as an offering to God: "Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog, into the house of the Lord thy God for any vow: for even both these are abomination unto the Lord thy God."—(Deut. xxiii. 18.)

Nor is it any different in the New Testament.

Our Lord uses the word to express insincere, worldly people, as when he says, "give not that which is holy to dogs," and again, "it is not meet to take the children's bread, and cast to it to dogs."

The Apostle Paul calls the false Apostles dogs by reason of their impudence and love of gain—"beware of dogs, beware of evil workers." Similarly in the Revelation we read of "dogs and sorcerers."

Even when it is said in the parable of Dives and Lazarus that "the dogs came and licked his sores," it is meant to imply, not so much, I think, that the dumb creatures supplied the sympathy that was lacking in man, as to express the abject condition of the beggar, seeing that even the unclean scavengers of the streets came to lick his festering wounds.

¹ The solitary exception to this that I can possibly think of is in the *Apocrypha*, Tobit v. 16, where "*the young man's dog*" is thought worthy of mention, and even regarded as a companion. Mary Howitt has a poem on this subject called "*Tobias' Dog*."

Now we, as I have said, hold the dog in very high esteem. We call him emphatically "the friend of man."

As Byron says in one place,

"'Tis sweet to hear the watch-dog's honest bark
Bay deep-mouthed welcome as we draw near home,
'Tis sweet to know there is an eye will mark
Our coming, and look brighter when we come."

and in another,

"In life the firmest friend,
The first to welcome, foremost to defend;
Whose honest heart is still his master's own,
Who labours, fights, lives, breathes for him alone."

And yet again the exile in *Childe Harold*, as he regretfully thinks of the home he has left, says :

"Deserted is my own good hall,
Its hearth is desolate ;
Wild weeds are gathering on the wall,
My dog howls at the gate."

When the great novelist Dickens, in *Oliver Twist*, describes the murderer Sykes wandering conscience-stricken in the London suburbs, and hearing accusing voices in every rustling leaf and every murmuring wind, he pictures the climax of his loneliness as reached at the moment when even his dog deserts him.

Many have endowed the dog with reason, and some even with a soul, and, like the poor Indian that Pope sings of, such an one

"thinks, admitted to that equal sky,
His faithful dog shall bear him company."

I propose in the following article to collect a few of the most noticeable passages where dogs and their virtues are celebrated by some of the leading poets.

Wordsworth, who is emphatically the poet of animate and inanimate nature, has many touching references to dumb animals. His brother-poet of the Lake school, Coleridge, had said in language which Wordsworth must have fully reciprocated :

"He prayeth well who loveth well
Both man and bird and beast :

* * *

"He prayeth best who loveth best
All things both great and small,
For the dear God who loveth us
He made and loved them all."

Of the three poems on dogs by Wordsworth from which I shall

quote, the first tells us how a hare starts off with four dogs after it in full cry :

“ All the four are in the race,
And the hare whom they pursue
Knows from instinct what to do :
Her hope is near, no turn she makes,
But like an arrow to the river makes.

“ Deep the river was and crusted
Thinly by a one night's frost,
But the nimble hare hath trusted
To the ice, and safely crossed.”

Two of the dogs, Prince and Swallow, also get safely over, but the brittle ice breaks under the weight of the greyhound Dart. Whereupon little Music, the fourth hound, loses all interest in the chase, and thinks only of her submerged companion.

“ Little Music, she stops short,
She hath neither wish nor heart,
Her's is now another part,
A loving creature she and brave,
And fondly strives her struggling friend to save.”

But her efforts are all in vain, though she stretches out her paws like very human hands,

“ nor gives o'er
Until her fellow sinks to reappear no more.”

In his second dog-poem, Wordsworth pays a feeling tribute to the memory of this same little dog Music, who has died of old age :

“ We grieved for thee, and wished thy end were past,
And willingly have laid thee here at last :
For thou hadst lived till everything that cheers
In thee had yielded to the weight of years :
Extreme old age had wasted thee away,
And left thee but a glimmering of the day ;
Thy ears were deaf, and feeble were thy knees,
I saw thee stagger in the summer breeze,
Too weak to stand against its sportive breath
And ready for the gentle stroke of death ;
It came and we were glad ! yet tears were shed,
Both man and woman wept when thou wast dead !
Not only for a thousand thoughts that were,
Old household thoughts in which thou hadst thy share,—
But for some precious boons vouchsafed to thee
Found scarcely anywhere in like degree.
For love, that comes wherever life and sense
Are given by God, in thee was most intense :
A tender sympathy which did thee bind
Not only to us men, but to thy kind.
Hence, if we wept, it was not done in shame,
Our tears from passion and from reason came,
And therefore shalt thou be an honoured name.”

Wordsworth's third dog-poem is our old friend Fidelity. The scene is, of course, laid in his beloved Lake district. A shepherd, seeking his flocks in the wild district of Helvellyn, hears a dog's bark :

"A barking sound the shepherd hears,
A cry as of a dog or fox;
He halts and searches with his eyes
Among the scattered rocks:
And now at distance can discern
A stirring in a brake or fern;
And instantly a dog is seen,
Glancing through that covert green.

"The dog is not of mountain breed,
Its motions too are wild and shy,
With something, as the shepherd thinks,
Unusual in its cry:
Nor is there anyone in sight
All round in hollow or on height;
Nor shout, nor whistle strikes his ear,
What is the creature doing here?"

The shepherd follows where the dog leads, and finds the decomposed body of a man who had been killed by a fall from the rocks.

The shepherd recalls his name, and remembers the occasion on which he passed that way. For three months the faithful dog had remained near his dead master.

"Yes, proof was plain, that since that day
When this ill-fated traveller died,
The dog had watched about the spot,
Or by his master's side:
How nourished here through such long time
He knows who gave that love sublime;
And gave that strength of feeling great
Above all human estimate."

With reference to this story it may be of interest to mention that a few years ago Canon Rawnsley, of Crosthwaite, and Miss Cobbe (the great anti-vivisection lecturer), caused a monument to be set up on the spot where the remains were found to commemorate the dog's faithfulness, and turned a deaf ear to the opinion of some critics and cynics who surmised that the dog had actually subsisted on the dead body.

It is most interesting perhaps to note that Sir Walter Scott has a poem on the same subject called "The Wanderer's Dog," and which begins :

"I climbed the dark brow of the mighty Helvellyn."

We may perhaps quote four lines :

"How long didst thou think that his silence was slumber?
 When the wind waved his garment how oft didst thou start?
 How many long days and long weeks didst thou number,
 Ere he faded before thee, the friend of thy heart?"

The same author (Scott) has also two other poems written on a similar topic and in the same strain; one called "Poor Yarrow" concludes thus:

"And close beside him in the snow
 Poor Yarrow, partner of his woe,
 Crouches upon his master's breast,
 And licks his cheek to break his rest."

In the other (*Lady of the Lake*, canto iii. xvii.), just after he has been bewailing Duncan in the well-known coronach,

"He is gone on the mountain,
 He is lost to the forest," &c.,

He proceeds:

"See Stumah,¹ who the bier beside
 His master's corpse with wonder eyed;
 Poor Stumah! whom his least halloo
 Could send like lightning o'er the dew,
 Bristles his crest, and points his ears,
 As if some stranger's step he hears."

What child has not had its little heart deeply stirred by the pathetic tale of "Bedd-Gelert," so plaintively told by the Hon. W. R. Spencer? And who has not shared Llewellyn's sorrow for his irreparable mistake, and his pain for the loss of his peerless dog?

"Ah! what was then Llewellyn's pain!
 For now the truth was clear:
 The gallant hound the wolf had slain
 To save Llewellyn's heir."

"Vain, vain was all Llewellyn's woe;
 Best of thy kind, adieu!
 The frantic deed that lay thee low
 This heart shall ever rue!"

This dog Gelert is said to have been given by King John to Llewellyn, his son-in-law. The dog's grave is still pointed out at the village of the same name near Snowdon. There is a much less known poem on the same subject by Horne, but in some ways it is even more powerful and pathetic than Spencer's; it is a pity to spoil the integrity of such a poem, but I really cannot refrain from quoting a couple of verses:

¹ = Faithful.

"The child awoke, and raised himself
 Upon his little hand;
 His rosy cheeks all dimpling smiled
 To see so many round him stand.
 The father ran, and falling on his knees,
 To his breast caught him,
 And held him fondly thus with frequent gaze,
 Such bliss it brought him.

"And art thou safe, my little child,
 Sweet flower-bud of my life and hope?
 A minute since my grief ran wild—
 My joy can scarcely now find scope.
 I know not if I hold thee safely yet
 And surely here;
 The child looked round, then cried with accent shrill,
 'Where's Gelert dear?'

* * *

"The old man led his child along
 Like silence after storm:
 Of all the leaden load of grief within
 No word he spake,
 But sought atonement for his cruel sin
 Humbly to make."

With regard to this poem, Bedd-Gelert, it is worthy of note that some such story is common to many nations; if we trace it back to its origin we shall find that it is really an ancient Aryan myth which has come down to us through several European sources. Indeed, it forms one of the stories of the Seven Sages, an Indian romance written probably before the Christian era.

The story itself is much the same as we have received it, except that it was an adder, instead of a wolf, that was slain, and the father, smitten with remorse for killing his dog, went down to the fish-pond in his orchard and drowned himself.

As a fourteenth-century translation has it,

"For the dole of his hound,
 He leaped in and sunk to the ground."

Cowper, in a well-known piece called "The Dog and the Water-Lilies," commemorates the intelligence of his spaniel Beau, whom he calls "prettiest of race and of high pedigree." The poem begins:

"It was the time when Ouse displayed
 His lilies newly-blown;
 Their beauties I intent surveyed
 And one I wished my own."

The poet tries to reach them with his stick and fails.

"Beau marked my unsuccessful pains
 With fixed considerate face,

And puzzling set his puppy brains
To comprehend the case."

After following the windings of the stream in their walk they returned, but Beau ran on in front and secured the coveted prize.

"I saw him with that lily cropped,
Impatient swim to meet
My quick approach, and soon he dropped
The treasure at my feet.

"Charmed with the sight, 'the world,' I cried,
'Shall hear of this thy deed :
My dog shall mortify the pride
Of man's superior breed.'"

In a later poem we find Cowper incensed with the same Beau for killing a young bird :

"Against my orders, whom you heard
Forbidding you the prey."

Beau is supposed to reply in verse, the conclusion of which is :

"If killing birds be such a crime
(Which I can hardly see),
What think you, sir, of killing time
With verse addressed to me?"

Scotch collies have always been famous for their beauty and sagacity. We find Burns, in a poem called "The Twa Dogs," contemptuously referring to an ill-favoured cur in the lines :

"His hair, his size, his mouth, his lugs,
Showed he was nane o' Scotland's dogs."

Monuments to the memory of favourite dogs, and epitaphs upon them, have been common in all ages.

At Newstead Abbey, the seat of Lord Byron, is the grave of the poet's Newfoundland dog "Boatswain," which bears the following extravagant eulogy :

"Near this spot
Are deposited the remains of one
Who possessed beauty without vanity,
Strength without insolence,
Courage without ferocity,
And all the virtues of man without his vices.
This praise, which would be unmeaning flattery
If inscribed over human ashes,
Is but a just tribute to the memory of
Boatswain, a dog."

Underneath are twenty-six lines of laudatory verse, of which the

last four lines may be quoted as showing not only the poet's affection for his dog, but his own morbid, melancholy temperament :

"Ye who perchance behold this simple urn,
Pass on : it honours none you wish to mourn.
To mark a friend's remains these stones arise ;
I never knew but one—and here he lies."

By his will of 1811, Lord Byron directed that his own body should be buried in a vault in the garden near his faithful dog.

Tennyson, in the "Idylls of the King," Geraint and Enid, mentions that King Arthur's favourite dog was called Cavall :

"And while they listened for the distant hunt,
And chiefly for the baying of Cavall,
King Arthur's hound of deepest mouth."

The late Laureate has also a poem on "Old Roü's" (Rover's) heroism at a fire, which is very fine, but requires to be read in its entirety. No doubt it would have been much more popular if it had not been written in the Northern Farmer's dialect.

An old farmer is telling little Dick how Roü, who is now "stoön-deaf and blind," saved his life when a baby, and how he means to cheer his age :

"But I meäns fur to mäike 'is owd äüge as 'appy as iver I can,
Fur I owäs owd Roäver moor nor I iver owäid mottal man."

"Thou's rode of 'is back when a babby, afoor thou was gotten too owd,
For e'd fetch an carry like owt, 'e was allus as good as gowd."

The farmer tells how he fell asleep and woke to find the house on fire. Rover carried the bairn to the window, but was very severely burnt, and with difficulty brought round. The farmer cannot make too much of him afterwards :

"An 'o sarved me sa well when 'e lived, that Dick when he cooms to
be deäd,
I thinks as I'd like fur to hev soom soort of a sarvice read."

"'Faithful and true,' them words be i' Scripture, and faäithful an' true
'Ull be fun' upo' four short legs ten times fur one upo' two."

Robert Browning has a very characteristic and graceful little poem on a dog, Tray.

A little beggar-girl, sitting and singing on the quay's edge, falls into the water. Before any of the bystanders attempt to render aid, a dog leaps into the water, and comes up with the rescued child in his mouth. To the surprise of the spectators he enters the water again—they suppose there must be another child immersed.

"How strange we saw no other fall !
 It's instinct in the animal.
 Good dog ! but he's a long while under:
 If he get drowned I should not wonder—
 Strong current that against the wall !

"Here he comes, holds in mouth this time—
 What may the thing be ? Well, that's prime !
 Now did you ever ? Reason reigns
 In man alone, since all Tray's pains
 Have fished—the child's doll from the slime !

"And so amid the laughter gay,
 Trotted my hero off—old Tray—
 Till somebody, prerogativéd
 With reason, reasoned : 'Why he dived
 His brain would show us, I should say.'"

And then, in his caustic, inimitable manner, the poet has a hit at the vivisectionists, with whom he had no sympathy at all :

"John, go and catch -- or, if needs be,
 Purchase that animal for me !
 By vivisection, at expense
 Of half-an-hour and eighteen-pence,
 How brain secretes dog's soul we'll see."

Browning attacks vivisectionists again in "Arcades Ambo," and thus speaks of one of their body :

"Who would have no end of brutes
 Cut up alive to see what suits
 My case, and save my toe from shoots."

Perhaps Mrs. Browning had the same idea in mind, when in one of her poems to her dog Plush, after invoking all kinds of blessings on her favourite's head, she says :

"Whiskered cats aointed flec,
 Sturdy stoppers keep from thee
 Cologne distillations !"

It is Lewis Morris, however, who waxes hottest against the very thought of vivisection. His language is strong enough to satisfy even Canon Wilberforce. He has two poems on the subject ; one is called "To the Tormentors"; we can only quote a few lines from it as it appeared in *Songs of Two Worlds*, third series :

"Great Heaven ! this shall not be, this present hell,
 And none denounce it ; well I know, too well,
 That Nature works by ruin and by wrong,
 Taking no care for any but the strong—
 Taking no care.

* * * *

"Tis but the same dead creed,
 Preaching the naked triumph of the strong ;
 And for their goddess Science, hard and stern,
 We shall not let her priests torment and burn :
 We fought the priests before, and not in vain ;
 And as we fought before so will we fight again."

His other poem on the subject is entitled "In a Laboratory." The poet is operating on a dog, and removes the left lobe of the brain, and then asks for a paw; the poor creature could only give the left, and the operator thinks he has proved a point :

"Brought the left paw over the helpless right,
 And I marked the effort with deep delight."

Having pushed knowledge so far, the experimentalist divided the opposite lobe of the brain, and the dog cannot now offer either paw : and again the vivisector thinks he has confirmed his law. Still athirst for knowledge, he operates again, and the poor wretch dies. And the last verse satirically says :

"Poor brute ! May his pain be for knowledge, and I,
 If I grasp not the clue, yet I may by-and-bye !
 Strange how weak man is, and infirm of will !
 For sometimes I see him, and shudder still !"

A little poem, "The Vagrant and his Dog," by Trowbridge, which begins :

"We are two travellers, Roger and I,"

illustrates the close intimacy that may exist between a dumb creature and even a worthless master :

"The rogue is growing a little old,
 For years we've tramped through wind and weather,
 And slept outdoors when nights were cold,
 And ate and drank and starved together."

Somewhat similar to the last is Campbell's address to his "poor dog Tray" :

"On the green banks of Shannon when Sheelah was nigh,
 No blithe Irish lad was so happy as I ;
 No harp like my own could so cheerily play,
 And wherever I went was my poor dog Tray."

The horror of the fierce bloodhounds, which were formerly trained to hunt down human beings, and especially in the time of the slave trade, is alluded to by several poets.

Scott, in the "Lay of the Last Minstrel," says :

"And hark, and hark ! the deep-mouthed bark
 Comes nigher still and nigher,
 Bursts on the path a dark bloodhound,
 His tawny muzzle tracked the ground
 And his red eye shot fire."

Lytton says :

“ With fangs that grin
And eyes that redden, raves the madding din.”

Longfellow has a reference to them in “ *The Slave in the Swamp* ” :

“ In dark fens of the dismal swamp
The hunted negro lay ;
He saw the fire of the midnight camp,
And heard at times a horse’s tramp,
And a bloodhound’s distant bay.”

While quoting Longfellow, we may mention his incidental allusion to the life-saving powers of the dogs of St. Bernard, in his poem, “ *Excelsior !* ” :

“ A traveller by a faithful hound
Half-buried in the snow was found,
Still grasping in his hand of ice
A banner with the strange device,
Excelsior ! ”

Dogs and children are mutually attached to each other. Two poems in particular I would like to quote as illustrating this—each beautiful in its own way.

The first is by Mr. Gerald Massey, and is entitled, “ *The Dead Boy’s Portrait and his Dog.* ” The dog is speaking :

“ Day after day I’ve come and sat
Beseechingly upon the mat,
Wistfully wondering what you’re at !
“ Why have they placed you on the wall,
So deathly still, so strangely tall ?
You do not turn to me, nor call.
“ Why do I never hear my name ?
Why are you fastened in a frame ?
You are the same, and not the same !
“ What has your little doggie done ?
You used to whistle me to run
Beside you, or ahead, for fun !
“ You used to pat me, and a glow
Of pleasure through my life would go !
How is it that I shiver so ?
“ I know not what has come to me.
’Tis only in my sleep I see
Things smiling as they used to be.
“ I watch the door, I watch the gate ;
I’m watching early, watching late,
Your doggie still, I watch and wait ! ”

The other hails, I think, from America ; but I cannot ascertain the author’s name :

“There was grieving in the woodshed,
 In the kitchen there were tears,
 When the morning showed that Tray was dead,
 The friend of many years.
 Ah ! I can well remember
 How the little children cried,
 And lifted up their voices
 When the old dog died.

“They clasped his rough and shaggy neck :
 They called his name in vain ;
 No more when Tommy whistled
 Would Tray bound forth again.
 The children ate no breakfast,
 But, seated by his side,
 They mourned their dearest playmate,
 When the old dog died.

“For thirteen summers he had brought
 The milch-cows home at night,
 And all that time he'd watched the house
 From dark till morning light.
 He'd even rock the cradle
 With a sort of canine pride,
 No wonder that the baby wept,
 When the old dog died.

“He'd go halfway to school with them,
 Then stand in lonesome plight,
 And slowly wag his bushy tail
 Till they were out of sight.
 Then trot him home to sleep and snooze
 Within his kennel wide —
 But Tommy brought the cattle home
 When the old dog died.”

When I quoted Robbie Burns just now I should have mentioned his epitaph on a lap-dog called Echo, which plays on the word “echo” and its associations :

“In wood and wild, ye warbling throng,
 Your heavy loss deplore ;
 Now half-extinct your powers of song,
 Sweet Echo is no more.

“Ye jarring, screeching things around,
 Scream your discordant cries,
 For half your din of tuneless sound
 With Echo silent lies.”

Pope tells us of a royal dog which had as the inscription on its collar :

“I am his Highness's dog at Kew,
 Pray tell me, sir, whose dog are you ?”

On a par with this may be mentioned Swift's inscription for a dog-collar :

"Pray steal me not, I'm Mrs. Dingley's,
Whose heart in this four-footed thing lies."

The same author (Swift) has a graceful poem on Rover, a lady's spaniel, which contains instructions to an artist how to paint the pet's portrait :

"Happiest of the spaniel race
Painter with thy colours grace :
Draw his forehead large and high,
Draw his blue and humid eye ;
Draw his neck so smooth and round,
Little neck with ribbons bound ;
And the spreading, even back,
Soft, and sleek, and glossy black ;
And the tail that gently twines
Like the tendrils of the vines," &c.

The great dramatist, Shakespeare, as was only to be expected, has some fine references to dogs.

Perhaps the most famous passage in which dogs figure occurs in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, Act iv., sc. 1. Theseus invites Hippolyta to listen to the music of the hunt :

"We will, fair queen, up to the mountain's top,
And mark the musical confusion
Of hounds and echo in conjunction."

Hippolyta replies :

"I was with Hercules and Cadmus once,
When in a wood of Crete they bayed the bear
With hounds of Sparta : never did I hear
Such gallant chiding ; for besides the groves,
The skies, the fountains, every region near
Seemed all one mutual cry : I never heard
So musical a discord, such sweet thunder."

Then Theseus rejoins with his well-known encomium on his sporting dogs :

"My hounds are bred out of the Spartan kind,
So flewed, so sanded ; and their heads are hung
With ears that sweep away the morning dew ;
Crook-kneed, and dew-lapped like Thessalian bulls ;
Slow in pursuit, but matched in mouth like bells,
Each unto each. A cry more tuneable
Was never hollaed to, nor cheered with horn,
In Crete, in Sparta, nor in Thessaly :
Judge when you hear."

The expression "matched in mouth like bells" receives a curious illustration and confirmation in Addison's humorous description of Sir Roger de Coverley's stophounds. This worthy knight had been presented with a dog possessed of an excellent *bass* voice, but he returned him to the donor, saying he only wanted a *counter-tenor* !

In early poetry dogs were chiefly celebrated for their prowess in the hunting-field rather than for any other good quality.

For Spartan dogs and other famous breeds, like the Molossian, we may compare Virgil's third *Georgic*. Greyhounds were prized by the Latins; Ovid compares Daphne's flight from Apollo to the swiftness of a greyhound. British dogs were famous in very early times; Claudian, one of the latest of the purely classical Latin poets, refers to

"the British hound,
That brings the bull's big forehead to the ground."

In the same play of Shakespeare as the above (*Midsummer Night's Dream*), when Demetrius tells Helena

"I do not nor I cannot love you,"

Helena replies :

"And even for that I do but love thee more.
I am your spaniel ; and Demetrius,
The more you beat me, I will fawn on you :
Use me but as your spaniel, spurn me, strike me,
Neglect me, lose me ; only give me leave,
Unworthy as I am, to follow you.
What worse place can I beg in your love
(And yet a place of high respect with me)
Than to be used as you use your dog."

With this speech may be compared (*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, Act iv., sc. 1) :

"Yet, spaniel-like, the more she spurns my love
The more it grows and fawneth on her still ;"

and the well-known proverb :

"A spaniel, a woman, a walnut-tree,
The more you beat them the better they be."

Macbeth begins his address to the murderers :

"Ay, in the catalogue ye go for men ;
As hounds and greyhounds, mongrels, spaniels, curs,
Shoughs, water-rugs, and demi-wolves are clepped
All by the name of dogs."

In *King Lear*, Lear says :

"The little dogs and all,
Tray, Blanch, and Sweetheart, see they bark at me." .

Then follows Edgar's imprecation :

"Avaunt, you curs !
Mastiff, greyhound, mongrel grim,
Hound or spaniel, brach or lym,
Or bobtail tyke or trundel-tail,
Tom will make them weep and wail."

In the introduction to the *Taming of the Shrew*, there enters a lord from hunting, who thus addresses his huntsman :

“Huntsman, I charge thee, tender well my hounds :
Brach¹ Merriman—the poor cur is embossed ;
And couple Clowder with the deep-mouthed brach.
Saw'st thou not, boy, how Silver made it good
At the hedge-corner, in the coldest fault ?
I would not lose the dog for twenty pound !”

The huntsman replies :

“Why, Belman is as good as he, my lord !
He cried upon it at the merest loss,
And twice to-day picked out the dullest scent ;
Trust me, I take him for the better dog.”

The lord retaliates :

“Thou art a fool : if Echo were as fleet,
I would esteem him worth a dozen such.
But sup them well and look unto them all ;
To-morrow I intend to hunt again.”

In the *Taming of the Shrew* we also find the origin of the expression “dog-tired” :

“O master, master, I have watched so long,
That I have grown dog-weary.”

In *Titus Andronicus*, Act ii., sc. 2, there is another hunting scene, which opens :

“The hunt is up, the morn is bright and grey,
The fields are fragrant, and the woods are green,
Uncouple here, and let us make a bay.”

Shakespeare also displays incidentally a considerable knowledge of dogs in his poem, *Venus and Adonis*.

There are two other brief references to dogs, which we must mention, in Shakespeare, before we leave him. The first is from *As You Like It*, Act i., sc. 1 :

“OLIVER. Get you with him, you old dog.

ADAM. Is old dog my reward ? Most true I have lost my teeth in your service.”

The other from *Timon of Athens*, Act iv., sc. 3 :

“APEMANTUS. What man didst thou ever know unthrift, that was beloved after his means ?

TIMON. Who, without those means thou talkest of, didst thou ever know beloved ?

¹ Various reading trash = check.

APEMANTUS. Myself.

TIMON. I understand thee; thou hadst some means to keep a dog."

Herrick, a poet whom I have always thought strangely underrated, who abounds in quaint conceits and delicate imagery, has a very graceful little epitaph on his spaniel, Tracie :

"Now thou art dead, no eye shall ever see,
For shape and service, spaniel like to thee.
This shall my love do, give thy sad death one
Tear, that deserves of me a million."

William Browne, in an eclogue called "The Shepherd's Pipe," is very amusing; the argument of the piece is set forth in the four lines that form the heading :

"Philos of his dog doth brag
For having many feats;
The while the cur undoes his bag
And all his dinner eats."

Gay's Fables are full of capital allusions to dogs. How natural and life-like is the picture he draws of the village cur, "the pertest puppy of the place," that persists in yelping at everybody and everything, and receives at last its due reward :

"Thy teasing tongue had judgment tied,
Thou hadst not as a puppy died."

Or, again, we have the mastiff, who, interfering with two fighting dogs, learnt the truth of the maxim :

"They who in quarrels interpose
Must often wipe a bloody nose."

Of purely Scotch effusions on dogs, perhaps the best is Hogg's "Auld Hector" :

"Come, my auld towsy, trusty friend,
What gars ye look sae sad wi' wae,
D'ye think my favour's at an end
Because thy head is turning grey ?

"Although thy strength begins to fail,
Its best was spent in serving me;
An' can I grudge thy wee bit meal,
Some comfort in thy age to gie ?"

We have already referred to the "poor Indian's" hope and belief in canine immortality. Southey expresses his firm adoption of the same creed in his elegy on the dog Phillis :

"Mine is no narrow creed,
And He who gave thee being did not frame
The mystery of life to be the sport
Of merciless man ! There is another world

For all that live and move—a better one—
Where the proud bipeds who would fain confine
Infinite goodness to the little bounds
Of their own charity, may envy thee."

In a similar vein Sir Francis Doyle celebrated a regimental pet, "The Fusiliers' Dog," and wrote on its monument:

"Not hopeless round this calm, sepulchral spot
A wreath presaging life we twine;
If God be love, what sleeps below was not
Without a spark divine."

Mr. R. Buchanan propounds the question in "The Schoolmaster's Story":

"Do doggies gang to heaven? Willie asked.
And oh! what Solomon of modern days
Can answer that? Yet here at night I sit,
Reading the Book with Donald at my side,
And stooping with the book upon my knee,
I sometimes gaze in Donald's patient eyes—
So sad, so human, though he cannot speak—
And think he knows that Willie is at peace,
'Far, far away, beyond the norland hills,
Beyond the silence of the untrodden snow."

Oliver Wendell Holmes also shares the same opinion, as attested by the following lines:

"I will not doubt that He
Is better than our fears, and will not wrong
The least, the meanest of created things."

A very clever poem is that of Dr. Norman Macleod, called "The Waggin' of Our Dog's Tail," in which the dog moralises upon the people he meets. The following verse is a fair specimen of its humour:

"He saw a laddie swaggerin' big,
From tap to tae sae trim, O!
Quo' he, 'It's no' for a dog to laugh
That ance was a pup like him, O!'"

Matthew Arnold has two very fine poems to the memory of two very dear dogs, Geist and Kaiser.

In the first one he tells us how the sight of the departed dog is ever present to his master's eyes:

"We stroke thy broad, brown paws again,
We bid thee to thy vacant chair,
We greet thee by the window-pane,
We hear thy scuffle on the stair;

"We see the flaps of thy large ears
Quick-raised to ask which way to go;
Crossing the frozen lake, appears
Thy small black form across the snow."

In the second poem, "Kaiser Dead," he tells us who Kaiser was :

"Six years ago I brought him down, •
A baby dog, from London town ;
Round his small throat of black and brown
A ribbon blue,
And vouched by glorious renown
A dachshound true.

"His mother, most majestic dame,
Of blood unmixed, from Potsdam came ;
And Kaiser's race we deemed the same—
No lineage higher :
And so he bore the imperial name.
But ah ! his sire !

"Soon, soon the days conviction bring ;
The collie hair, the collie swing,
The tail's indomitable ring,
The eye's unrest—
The case was clear ; a mongrel thing
Kai stood confest.

"But all those virtues which commend
The humbler sort who serve and tend.
Were thine in store, thou faithful friend.
What sense, what cheer !
To us declining towards our end,
A mate how dear !"

Horsfield has a very charming poem on "Old Rocket," a grand old sporting dog. These are the last two verses :

"The merry 'Twelfth will come again ; the guns may rattle fast ;
The birds may spring as blithely as of yore ;
But the brightest days will differ from the brightness of the past,
For a true old friend will share them nevermore.

"Is a man a hopeless heathen if he dreams of one fair day
When, with spirit free from shadows grey and cold,
He may wander through the heather in the 'unknown far away,'
With his good old dog before him as of old ?"

This same happy hopefulness that there is an Elysium in store for good dogs characterised much of the poetry on the dog : we may cite two more instances. Mortimer Collins writes as follows on "Tory, a Puppy" :

"He lies in the soft earth under the grass,
Where they who love him often pass :
And his grave is under a tall young lime,
In whose boughs the pale-green hop-flowers climb ;
But his spirit, where does his spirit rest ?
It was God who made him—God knows best."

Mr. James Payn has a very humorous but very affectionate ditty on "Our Dog Jock" :

"A rollicksome, frolicsome, rare old cock,
As ever did nothing was our dog Jock;
A gleesome, fleasome, affectionate beast,
As slow at a fight, as swift at a feast!

* * * *

Never more now shall our knees be pressed
By his dear old chops in their slobbery rest!

* * * *

Our old friend's dead, but we all well know
He's gone to the kennels where the good dogs go,
Where the cooks be not, but the beef-bones be,
And his old head never need turn for a flea!"

Vincent Bourne, whom Charles Lamb called that "most classical and at the same time most English of Latinists," wrote his "Epitaphium in Canem" to the memory of blind Irus' wolf-dog. This is familiar to all classical scholars. It commences:

"Pauperis hic Iri requiesco Lyciscus, herilis
Dum vixi, tutela vigil columenque senecta
Dux cecoco fidus."

Lamb himself translated it into English, beginning as follows:

"Poor Irus' faithful wolf-dog, here I lie,
That wont to tend my old blind master's steps,
His guide and guard."

Cowper wrote an epitaph on a pointer in the form of a riddle:

"Here lies one who never drew
Blood himself, yet many slew;
Gave the gun its aim, and figure
Made in field, yet ne'er pulled trigger;

* * * *

And to all this fame he rose,
Only following his nose.

* * * *

And your wonder vain to shorten,
Was pointer to Sir John Throckmorton."

Two Oriental legends connected with dogs may be briefly alluded to.

One tells us how Jesus and some of his disciples came upon a crowd in the market-place regarding and discussing a dead dog. Each had some fresh defect or ugliness to point out in the carcase, and each suggested some fresh flaw in its character. When it came to Christ's turn he gently remarked:

"Pearls cannot equal the whiteness of his teeth."

There are many metrical versions of the story; one is to be found in Alger's Eastern poetry. The best I have ever read is by

Miss Ellice Hopkins, but it is many years since I read her rendering and I cannot trust myself to quote from memory. I have myself written a metrical version of the legend, which I append :

“ AN ANCIENT LEGEND.

“ One day, so runs the story, Jesus went
His way, on mercy's ministrations bent,
And chanced to see far off a laughing crowd
Of loiterers holding discourse lewd and loud.
The gentle Saviour stepped aside to see
What might the cause of this commotion be,
And found a poor dog's carcass lying there,
At which a ribald rabble stopped to stare.
It lay all mangled, grimed with dirt and dust,
And each that saw it signified disgust!
One held his nose, one kicked it as it lay,
And each had some abusive word to say :
‘ Why should the loathsome beast defile the earth ? ’
‘ In his whole corpse is not a copper's worth ! ’
‘ Not e'en a shoe-lace from his battered hide ! ’
‘ The surly brute no doubt in fighting died ! ’
‘ Mark his blear eyes, bruised ears, and bones all bare.’
‘ The putrid hound pollutes the very air ! ’
‘ 'Tis shame that such an eyesore should be left ! ’
‘ The prowling cur was doubtless hung for theft ! ’

“ Then Jesus spake ; a single, silvery word,
That flashed reproach on every one that heard :
‘ E'en pearls of purest lustre lose their glow
Before those ivory teeth of whitest snow.’

“ The crowd slunk back, and whispered, ‘ We have seen
Jesus of Galilee, the Nazarene ;
For surely none of all on earth save He
In meanest things some hidden good could see ! ’

* * * *

“ Only a legend ? Be it so, no more !
But down the stream of time tradition bore
The tale, to teach that none should dare condemn
Things poor and paltry, but discern in them
The Father's handiwork, and try to trace
Some traits of beauty even in the base.

“ And he who fain would Christ's disciple be
Must first attain such Christ-like charity.”

The second legend I refer to is told by Sir Edwin Arnold, in his fine poem, “ Mercy's Reward.” An adulteress is led out to be stoned to death. On the way she passes a dog lying in the glaring sun, and dying of thirst, and she draws water for it in her shoe :

“ But the King,
Riding within his litter, marked this thing :

* * * *

'The law is that the people stone thee dead
For that which thou hast wrought; but there is come
Fawning around thy feet a witness dumb,
Not heard upon thy trial.

I hold rule
In Allah's stead, who is "the merciful,"
And hope for mercy; therefore, go thou free—
I dare not show less pity unto thee!"

Drummond has a very pointed little epitaph on a dog, Melampus, possessed of good vocal powers. Those who can remember the stentorian lung-power of the parish clerks of olden days will appreciate the humour of it:

"If you'd not seen him, but had heard him bark,
You would have sworn he was the parish clerk!"

Bloomfield has an equally pointed one to the foxhound Trouncer:

"Short was the strain of monumental woe!
Foxes, rejoice! here buried lies your foe."

There is an epitaph, in very dog Latin, over an unknown dog, Crony, by an unknown author:

"Eheu! hic iacet Crony,
A dog of much renown,
Nec fur, nec macaroni,
Though born and bred in town.

"In war he was acerrimus,
In dog-like arts perite,
In love, alas! miserrimus,
For he died of a rival's bite.

"His mistress struxit cenotaph;
And as the verse comes pat in,
Ego qui scribo epitaph
Indite it in dog Latin."

Lord Sherbrooke, when Mr. Robert Lowe, wrote the following lines on the burial-place of Lady Dorothy Nevill's dogs at Dangstein, depicting the virtues of the canine race:

"Soft lie the turf on those who find their rest
Here on our common mother's ample breast,
Unstained by meanness, avarice, and pride,
They never flattered and they never lied;
They ne'er intrigued a rival to displace,
They ran but never betted on a race,
Content with harmless sports and moderate food.
Boundless in love and faith and gratitude.
Happy the man, if there be any such,
Of whom this epitaph can say as much."

In Praed's charming poem, "Our Vicar," there is a pleasant

description, how, when even a stranger knocked at the hospitable doors of the vicarage, he was received with welcome by "our dogs":

"And Don and Sancho, Tramp and Tray,
Upon the parlour steps collected,
Wagged all their tails as if to say:
'Our master knows you, you're expected.'"

Charles Kingsley, who had all the instincts of a keen sportsman and a lover of nature, has one or two graphic allusions to dogs. In his "Ode to the North-East Wind" we read:

"Chime, ye dappled darlings,
Down the roaring blast;
Ye shall see a fox die
Ere an hour be past."

In the song from the *Water Babies*, "When all the world is young, lad!" we have this verse:

"Then hey for boot and horse, lad!
And round the world away;
Young blood must have its course, lad!
And every dog his day!"

The proverb about every dog having his day is also found in Shakespeare's *Hamlet*:

"Let Hercules himself do what he may,
The cat will mew, the dog will have his day."

Another proverbial couplet runs thus:

"The beggar's dog, the widow's cat,
Feed them, and soon thou shalt grow fat."

It is Kingsley, too, who familiarises us with another proverbial saying, in his invitation to Tom Hughes:

"Helping when we meet them,
Lame dogs over stiles."

We are also indebted to Charles Kingsley for the words of an old Wessex song, which he quotes in his delightful story, *Two Years Ago*:

"My dog he has his master's nose,
To smell a knave through silken hose;
If friends or honest men go by,
'Welcome,' quoth my dog and I!

"Of foreign tongues let scholars brag,
With fifteen names for a pudding-bag:
Two tongues I know no'er told a lie,
And their owners be my dog and I!"

Of professedly comical poems on dogs, every one, of course, is familiar with "The Mad Dog," by Goldsmith, and which begins :

" Good people all of every sort,
Give ear unto my song,
And if you find it wondrous short,
It cannot hold you long."

I never could see any wit in it myself, nor very much in Hood's punning lament of a poor blind man, which begins :

" O what shall I do for a dog ?
Of sight I have not a particle,
Globe, Standard, or Sun,
Times, Chronicle, none
Can give me a good leading article."

The poem goes on to dilate on the different kinds of dogs he had tried to lead his string.

With the last-mentioned we may compare the Dutchman's song :

" O vare and O vare can my leetle dawg be ? "

Of course, the two in the *Ingoldsby Legends* are the funniest, and we cannot pass them by without mention.

The first one is called "The Cynotaph," and is a good instance of Barham's (the author's) wonderful powers of rhyming :

" Oh ! where shall I bury my poor dog Tray,
Now his fleeting breath has passed away ?
Seventeen years, I can venture to say,
Have I seen him gambol, and frolic, and play,
Ever more happy, and frisky, and gay,
As though every one of his months was May,
And the whole of his life one long holiday—
Now he's a lifeless lump of clay :
Oh ! where shall I bury my faithful Tray ? "

The poet soliloquises on the question, and at last selects a site :

" Stay ! Let me see ! Ay, here it shall be,
At the foot of the gnarled and time-worn tree,
Where Tray and I
Would often lie
And watch the bright clouds as they floated by
In the broad expanse of the clear blue sky,
When the sun was bidding the world good-bye
And the plaintive nightingale warbling nigh
Poured forth his mournful melody ;
While the tender wood-pigeon's cooing cry
Has made me say to myself with a sigh,
' How nice you would eat with a steak in a pie ! '

"Ay, here it shall be! far, far from the view
Of the noisy world and its maddening crew.
Simple and few,
Tender and true,
The lines o'er his grave. They have some of them, too
The advantage of being remarkably new.

EPITAPH.

Affliction sore
Long time he bore,
Physicians were in vain!
Grown blind, alas! he'd
Some prussic acid,
And that put him out of his pain!"

The other one is called "Sancho, the Bagman's Dog." It is facetiously headed, "Stant litore *puppies*! (Virgil!)"

"It was a litter, a litter of five,
Four are drowned, and one left alive,
He was thought worthy alone to survive;
And the bagman resolved upon bringing him up,
To eat of his bread and drink of his cup,
He was such a dear little cock-tailed pup."

He, however, got lost and no searchings could find him.

"And the bagman stormed, and the bagman swore,
As never a bagman had sworn before;
But storming or swearing little avails
To recover lost dogs with great curly tails."

Blogg, the bagman, gets wrecked near the French coast, and is saved by a dog, which turns out to be Sancho. They put up at an inn, where the innkeeper and some confederates burst into the room to rob and murder. Sancho proves himself a friend in need, and defends his master tooth and nail (especially the former!) against his assailants, and when one of them attacked the dog,

*"Then a fresh bite of Sancho's
Took out the whole sent of his striped calimancoes!"*

When dealing with epitaphs, I should have mentioned one by William Watson:

"His friends he loved. His fellest earthly foes—
Cats—I believe he did but feign to hate.
My hand will miss the insinuated nose,
Mine eyes the tail that wagged contempt at fate."

Charles Reade once wrote some lines on a dog which he called Tonic, because it was made up of *bark*, w(h)ine, and *steel* (*steal*)!

A lady once asked a gentleman for a motto for her dog Spot. He suggested "Out, damned Spot!" She thought it was lacking in taste.

Lord Macaulay, in his tragic poem "Virginia," pours scathing contempt on Appius Claudius in the lines :

"But the vile Claudian litter, raging with currish spite,
Still yelps and snaps at those who run, still runs from those who
smite."

. It may be remarked that Macaulay hated dogs as much as Sydney Smith, and Goethe, and Alfred de Musset.¹

The Romans do not seem to have thought very highly of dogs on the whole. In fact, the phrase "to go to the dogs" (though various explanations have been given) probably refers to the fact that, amongst the Romans, the lowest throw at dice (three aces) was called *canis*; hence *canis* meant loss or ruin.

In classical story the dog Mœra was famous. Icaros was slain and buried under a tree. His daughter Erigone was guided to the spot by the howling of Mœra, and when she discovered the body hung herself for grief.

Icaros became the constellation Bootes, Erigone the constellation Virgo, and Mœra the star Procyon, which rises in July a little before the dog-star (Sirius).

The names of the fifty dogs of Actæon have been handed down, and it is remarkable what a similarity there is between many of the ancient and modern names—*e.g.*, Rover, Spot, Fido, &c., have their equivalents in Latin and Greek.

There is an old proverb, "As lazy as Laurence's dog," in allusion to an old tradition that this dog used to lean its head against a wall to bark.

Fingal's dog was named Bran, and the saying "Mar e Bran, is e a brathair" (if he be not Bran, he is Bran's brother) is the proverbial reply of Maccombrich in Scott's *Waverley*, chapter xlv.

Katmir was the dog of the Seven Sleepers who slept 309 years, which never moved or ate all the time—it was admitted by Mahomet into Paradise; hence to call a dog Katmir is to imply belief in its immortality.

The phrase "dogs of war" comes from Shakespeare, *Julius Cæsar*, iii. 1 :

"Cry *Havoc!* and let slip the dogs of war."

The expressions black dog (of a sullen person), dog in the manger, dog and the shadow, come from *AEsop's Fables*.

There are other proverbial sayings about dogs besides those already quoted, *eg.* :

"Let sleeping dogs lie."

"His bark is worse than his bite."

"Dog don't eat dog."

"Take a hair of the dog that bit you."

¹ It was Macaulay who defined a dog as "an animal that spoils conversation," and used to ridicule Bacon's dictum, "Man is the God of the dog."

This last one refers to an old custom of roasting and eating the heart of a mad dog ; another idea was that a burnt hair of the dog was a remedy against its bite.

There was a rabbinical superstition that dogs howl near a house where a person is dying. Longfellow refers to this in the "Golden Legend," iii. :

" In the rabbinic book it saith
The dogs howl when with icy breath
Great Sammüel, the Angel of Death,
Takes through the town his flight."

Dog-sleep = pretended or false sleep ; compare dog Latin, dog rose, dog violet.

Dog-watch, however, is a corruption of dodge-watch—it consisted of two short watches. one from four to six, and another six to eight in the evening, by way of varying the routine on board.

The Isle of Dogs gets its name from the following circumstance : When Greenwich was a place of Royal residence, the kennel for the monarch's hounds was on the opposite side of the river ; hence it was called the Isle of Dogs.

But remarks on dogs and doggiana, in fact and fiction, prose and verse, might be largely extended, and I fear that I have already exceeded my limits, and yet have left much unsaid.

There are many dogs, both known and unknown to history, that have not yet found a bard to celebrate their prowess in song, so that there is scope for rising poets and poetesses to turn their talents in this direction.

There is, for instance, the famous Saint Bernard dog, Barry, who saved more than forty lives in the early part of the present century and whose stuffed skin is in the museum at Berne.

It is perhaps hardly correct to say that Barry has not been celebrated in verse, for Rogers has a somewhat feeble poem in his honour. Moreover, Caroline Fry has perpetuated the legend that a dog of Saint Bernard (meaning probably Barry) was mistaken for a wolf by a traveller in the snow to whom the dog was bringing food and wine tied to its neck, and was shot by the traveller, who had just strength enough left to pull the trigger. As regards Barry such a story has no foundation in fact.

Then there is Sir Isaac Newton's dog, Diamond, famous, or rather infamous, for destroying the great mathematician's valuable notes on prismatic colours, which he had laboriously accumulated for many years. Whilst its master was at Trinity College Chapel, the dog managed to upset a candle in his college rooms, which reduced the precious manuscript to ashes. The great discoverer of the theory of gravitation, on observing his loss, only said, "Diamond, Diamond, you little know what mischief you have done."

There is, too, the faithful little dog that attended the fair Mary, Queen of Scots, at the last sad moment of her life.

There is Landseer's favourite dog, Brutus, the immortalised Katmir already mentioned, and a host of others in ancient and modern times whose name is legion.

How many of my readers, I wonder, have ever visited the Dogs' Burial Ground, in the garden of the Porter's Lodge, Victoria Gate, Hyde Park, Bayswater Road, opened in 1859 and shortly to be closed, all available space being occupied by small graves with white marble headstones. One belongs to the Duke of Cambridge, and on the marble are the words, "Poor little Prince." Another stone has the words, "To Faustie, Faithful Friend; lovely, loving, loved." Many others are to be seen, all of which afford touching evidence of the intense affection that the poor dog has often felt and inspired.

Whilst speaking of dogs' graves, there is still one canine sepulchre that I should like to mention. Visitors to Cambridge may have noticed it. It is in the Fellows' Garden at my old College of Peterhouse, and its history is this:

In 1867, Mr. F. W. Raikes (brother of the late Postmaster-General) who had previously been an officer in the Navy, entered the college as a Fellow-commoner. He had a dog called Lion which was much attached to him. The story went that when abroad Raikes was once asleep on the sea-shore, and being attacked by robbers was saved by his dog. Thenceforth Lion and his master were inseparable.

The Master and Fellows of Peterhouse allowed them to come to college together, though it was against all college regulations—a concession which opened the door in subsequent years to many other curs.

However, Lion soon afterwards died, probably from the effects of the unwonted dainties derived from the high table, and he was interred in the Fellows' Garden.

His tomb may still be seen, and if the moss and ivy which have overgrown the stone be removed the inscription may be discerned. This was written by the Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, late Fellow of the college, and runs thus:

"*Quo desiderium? Nunc inter sidera versor!*"

"*Dic mihi, quid tu fis? Sirius?—Immo Leo!*"

which may be thus freely translated at the risk of its being accounted *doggerel*!

"*Dear master, O cease to bemoan,*

I've a place 'mongst the stars with Orion!"

"*Do you mean that as Dog-star you're known?—*

—Oh no! as of old, I'm the Lion!"

The mention of Peterhouse reminds me of a very virulent attack upon the whole race of dogs, which was made a few years ago in the *Journal of Science* under the title "Modern Cynolatry," because a Peterhouse man, Mr. H. B. Baildon, published a very able article, "A Defence of the Dog," in reply to it.

Mr. Baildon's paper is very interesting, as he seems to have made both a physiological and psychological study of the subject. He discusses the question how dogs communicate ideas, as they unquestionably do, to one another without speech. He says :

"I have noticed, as every one acquainted with dogs must often have done, one dog run up to another, and simply by laying his nose to his crony's, put him in possession of some fact, idea, or intention. One could, at any rate, draw no other inference from their conduct, seeing that they immediately started off together in a most purposeful style, as though resolved and unanimous. It was just as though one said to the other, for example: 'The gardener's cat is sitting on the window-sill; suppose we go and hunt her?' To which, to judge by the alacrity of his consent, the other seems to reply: 'All right, old fellow, with the greatest pleasure.'

"If the outer world expresses itself to the dog's mind mainly in terms of smell (as ours does mainly in terms of sight), and if, as seems very possible, his mind correlates these sensations so far that his smell-world becomes a whole and not a mere series of separate impressions, does it not seem likely that even as we can express so much directly by the eye, though by no means shut up to this instrument of expression by reason of our gift of language, so the dog may have some faculty of expressing himself through the nose.

"This would, no doubt, involve the faculty of emitting a certain odour at will, so as to form a code of smell-signals.

"And the incredibility of this idea is considerably lessened when we recall the fact that many animals have the faculty of evolving certain very perceptible odours when excited or irritated."

However, I must really rein in my flowing pen.

I am fully conscious that my article has been strung together without much regard to method or order, and that the poetical authors have not been quoted in any strict chronological sequence, but just as they served to illustrate my subject. I have also omitted very early writers, such as Chaucer, and the mediæval metrical romances; still I shall be fully satisfied if the contents of this paper have justified to any of its readers the title thereof, and shown that dogs have been treated of, and respectfully and affectionately treated of, in poetry.

The dog has ever seemed to me worthy of the trust reposed in him. One of the most encouraging features of the nineteenth century is the increasing care and attention that has been paid to dumb animals.

It is almost incredible what wonderful feats dogs can be taught to perform with care and patience. I read in a ladies' paper the

other day that a well-known Peeress has invented a new profession for her pet dogs. She has taught her fox-terriers to act as train-bearers; and wonderfully well they do it, and take an affectionate pride in their own grace and skilfulness. Perhaps the idea may be further developed by brides with sporting tastes.

Some day the report of a smart wedding may contain such a paragraph as this: "The train-bearers were Ruby and Spot, favourite fox-terriers of the bride; each wore a white satin coat embroidered with orange-blossom, and a silver collar, the gift of the bridegroom!"

The poacher's well-known dog, the lurcher, is by no means to be despised. Its wisdom and sagacity are something wonderful. The word "lurcher" itself is from the old use of the verb "lurch"—to intercept, steal; (*cf.* Shakespeare's *Coriolanus*, ii. 2.)

"And in the brunt of seventeen battles since
He lunched all swords of the garland."

And Gay:

"Swift from the play the scudding *lurcher* flies."

The true Norfolk lurcher was originally a cross between the greyhound (for speed) and the retriever (for scent). Some trainers never allow them out in the daytime, but accustom them to the dark. Their skill and cunning are almost beyond belief.

Not the least interesting of all the modes of celebrating the "Diamond Jubilee" year was the extension of the "Dogs' Home" at Battersea by the establishment of a branch home in the country. The Queen heartily approved of the project, and doubled her subscription to the home.

An investigation of the literature of the dog will, I am sure, well repay him who takes it in hand.

If he turns to the poets alone, the ground he will have to cover will cause him to peruse many elegant passages, and reveal to him many unknown and unsuspected beauties in English literature, and he will perhaps realise more fully than ever before that the dog deserves to be called:

"The joy, the solace, and the aid of man,
The rich man's guardian, and the poor man's friend,
The only creature faithful to the end."

or, as a cynic once said, "The more I see of *my friends*, the more I love *my dogs*."

Yes, faithful still, in spite of ill-treatment, muzzling orders, and vivisectionists. And how forgiving dogs are! If you accidentally

injure them, how they immediately wag their tails, as if to say,
“Don't think about it, I know you didn't mean it”!

“Yea, serving long, in spite of wrong,
“'Twould die upon our grave”;

or, to quote the couplet which occurs in Lord Lytton's *Arthur*, and
has long since almost passed into a proverbial saying:

“For never yet the dog our bounty fed,
Betrayed our kindness or forgot our bread.”

J. HUDSON.

TATTOOING AND ITS HISTORY.

FEW boys there are who will not cheerfully undergo a considerable amount of positive pain in tattooing themselves, under the delusion they are beautifying their persons! Whether this practice, so persistent and so prevalent, proceeds from a sense of mistaken stoicism—to show how much suffering they can stand—or from an idea that the result really conduces towards personal embellishment, would be a nice point in schoolboy psychology. The process, as each youngster well knows, consists in puncturing the back of the hand or the fingers, the fleshy part of the arm or the chest, with a sharp needle, following up this operation by rubbing Chinese ink into the bleeding part. As the outer skin, or *epidermis*, has been perforated, and the pigment introduced into the *dermis*, or lower layer of the integument, the mark left when the pricks heal is practically indelible, an additional recommendation to the boyish mind, though whether this opinion remains in after-life is doubtful.

Our sailors also, in nine cases out of ten, carry about with them, punctured all over the body, an art gallery in miniature, vessels with a full stretch of sail, flags, snakes, dragons, and impossible sea-monsters, as terrible as the perfervid imagination of Pliny or Schiller in his ballad of the *Diver* could ever conceive. In fact between a British tar and a Rarotongan and Samoan chief there is not much to choose in the matter of tattooing when both are stripped, save that the latter may exhibit a trifle greater intricacy in design and superior skill in execution. Probably when thus practising the art of “embellishing” their persons, our schoolboys and jolly tars never dream they are furnishing a striking argument in favour of *Atavism*, or reversion to the customs of our savage ancestors, who, after daubing the face and the body with *wood* in those places where they wished the colours to be permanent, pricked it into the skin with sharp-pointed instruments.

Tattooing is one of the most ancient customs of barbarous nations. The effort to discover its origin carries us far back into prehistoric times—into the grey dawn of the world, in fact. At various epochs it may be said to have been practised all over the habitable globe. Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Oceania, one and all furnish traces of it, taking rank in the first instance as a sacred rite, but gradually losing its religious symbolism and becoming a mere adjunct of personal embellishment.

The first question is, Where did it originate? That can scarcely be answered with precision. Let us seek a reply first of all from the country where tattooing to-day is most extensively in vogue—to wit, New Zealand. For a Maori chief not to have his face covered with the most intricate and delicately artistic tattooing would mean a supreme degradation. It would stamp him as lower even than a *soahine* (woman). For the females among the New Zealand natives so tattoo the lids as to substitute for the ruby-red hue around the mouth a slatey-blue tinge that is reckoned a point of beauty. A man who is not “adorned” in this way, therefore, has presumably less power of enduring physical suffering than a woman—a terrible reproach in the Maori code of honour!

The Maoris themselves do not claim the initiation of the custom. They admit having received it from others. To a period immensely anterior to the migration of that race from Hawaiki or Hawaii into New Zealand—about five hundred years ago—the practice undoubtedly points, and certain chiefs of the Ngapuhi, Ngatimaniapoto, and Ngatiwhatua tribes confessed to the Rev. Samuel Marsden that the Maoris had received it, as their traditions related, from the sun-rising, *i. e.*, from the *East* or America. Let us follow it thither.

Among the Toltecs and Aztecs of Central and South America the custom of tattooing the face and body was universal. As the Toltec Empire attained the meridian of its glory about 1500 B.C. (according to Bancroft and the Abbé Brasseur de Bourbourg) and the Aztec about 800 years later (Baldwin's *Ancient America*, and M. Désire Charnay, *Buried Cities of Central America*), some idea may be gained of the great antiquity of the practice. Regarded as a religious rite, the designs executed were all of a symbolical character embracing Ra the sun, the mystic *cruz ansata* or cross-shapen like the letter T, the Moon and Stars, and the sacred “Tree of Life.” As far as can be ascertained, the operation was always performed by the priests, and in all probability originated, at least as far as the Western Hemisphere is concerned, amid the advanced civilisation which prevailed in Mexico and Central America many centuries before the Christian Era.

Both the Toltecs and the Aztecs, there is every reason to believe, despatched numerous colonies to people the islands of the South Seas archipelagoes. By these migrating streams of humanity the ancient customs of the continent were carried westward. Hence we find tattooing practised all over the islands of the Pacific, from Easter Island to Fiji. But, singularly enough, from very early times we discover traces of the habit prevailing largely both in Europe and Asia. Herodotus (*Terpsichore*, chapter vi.) refers to the custom as usual amongst the Thracians in the following terms: “To have punctures on their skin is with them a mark of nobility; to be without these is a testimony of mean descent.” Herein can be traced a

curious analogy in social observances between the Maori chief and the ancient Thracian noble. Is the similarity the result of chance, or does it indicate a common origin? Plutarch also states that the Thracians of his time made these tattoo marks on their wives to avenge the death of Orpheus, the poet and musician, whom they had murdered during their Maenad fury while celebrating the mysteries of Bacchus. If this be the true reason, as Larcher says, it is remarkable that what in its origin was a punishment inflicted on one sex should afterwards be reckoned an ornament and a mark of nobility for both.

Among the Germans, Gauls, and Celtiberi of the age of Cæsar and of the Roman Empire tattooing the body, and among some tribes the face, was extensively prevalent. From the Pillars of Hercules to the Euxine there were nations who looked upon the custom as either a religious observance or tending to personal adornment, the two feelings that seem to have everywhere induced the adoption of this singular and by no means painless practice.

Isidore in the *Pictorial History of England*, in speaking of the Picts, whose name he asserts was derived from their coloured skins—an etymology, by the way, accepted by Burton and Skene—goes on to state that the painting was done by squeezing out the juice of certain herbs over the body, and puncturing in the design with a sharp-pointed instrument. Throughout the whole of the Anglo-Saxon period in England the practice was in vogue among the nobility. Students of William of Malmesbury's *Chronicle* will remember that tattooing was one of the exclusively English vices so severely reprobated by that historian after the Norman Conquest.

By many of the tribes on the Western coast of Africa, by the Zulus, the Kaffres, and the Matabeles tattooing is practised largely as a penitential rite to propitiate their gods. Among others it is the exclusive mark of a wizard or rain-maker, as also among several of the tribes of North American Indians, the Pawnees, Blackfeet, and Sioux, it was and is the privilege of a "medicine man" to be thus decorated.

It is also curious to note that the designs adopted in tattooing by the Rarotongans, Maoris, and many of the South Sea Islanders, are almost identical with those in vogue in Africa and America. This would seem to imply a common origin at some far distant period, and that the initial symbolism intended to be conveyed by it was of a religious character. For example, the design of the tattooing on the cheeks of Tawhiao, the Maori king who died a few years ago, and whose visit to England in 1884 excited so much interest, was a series of diminishing convolutes, extending from the lower end of the nasal fossæ back to the maxillary bone, thus covering the entire cheek. On either temple was a succession of concentric circles, executed with remarkable fidelity to equidistance from each other.

The design followed in Tawhiao's tattooing may be said to be that pretty generally adopted by the majority of the chiefs. Some of them exhibit a rayed glory surrounding a face. This, they explain, is a representation of the sun, and had in former days a penitential significance. This, however, it has in some degree lost, though the older *tohungas* (priests) still prescribe it as an unfailing means of propitiating the wrath of the gods. Before Chinese ink or gunpowder could be procured charcoal was the colouring substance employed.

In Rarotonga the chiefs were in the habit of tattooing not only the face but the body likewise, the design adopted being transverse bars running from the chin to the navel. But the custom is losing its hold in the island, and soon will be confined only to those who adhere to the older faith.

Where tattooing is identified with the religion of any of the islands in the South Seas where it is in vogue, the missionaries, of course, set their faces against it, and little by little the prevalence of tattooing is beginning to be circumscribed. Some of the younger men also, whom European habits and vices have rendered effeminate, no longer feel inclined to undergo the suffering incident upon its production. They do not see the marks on the generality of Europeans, and make this the excuse for demitting the practice.

There is little doubt, however, that tattooing would never have retained its hold upon so many diverse peoples, so widely scattered over the surface of the globe, were it due solely to a desire for personal embellishment and bodily ornament. Behind the mere fact there must lie a background of religious symbolism, with a sense of propitiatory value in the pain undergone while the marks are being punctured. Granted, in many instances, that among the rank and file of the tribe the sacred accessories of the act have been lost sight of through the lapse of time, when one can penetrate the crust of reserve in which the priesthood of all races are apt to envelop themselves, it will be discovered, as in the case of the *tohungas* among the Maoris and the ancient *tolas* among the Rarotongans, that a sacred significance *does* attach to the performance of the rite of tattooing, and that for a native to neglect it would be equivalent to braving the wrath of their country's gods. Thus the younger men who demit it are actually proving untrue to the religion of their country, whether they recognise it or not.

The simple boyish practice of tattooing, when investigated, is found to have historical associations connected with it which carry us away back to a time when the world, both in its physical and political arrangement, was very different from what it is to-day—when, in fact, civilisations prevailed which for thousands of years have been extinct, and their very memory relegated to the region of myth and fable.

OLIPHANT SMEATON.

IS PARLIAMENT SO SHOCKING?

"THE lowered character of Parliamentary government;" and again, "in England no one can be insensible to the change in the tone of the House of Commons within the memory of living man. The old understandings and traditions on which its deliberations have been for many generations successfully conducted have largely disappeared, and new and stringent regulations have been found necessary. Scenes of coarse and brutal insult, of deliberate obstruction, of unrestrained violence, culminating on one occasion in an actual exchange of blows, have been displayed within its walls to which there have been few parallels in other legislatures." In such language does the most prominent of living historians lament the decadence of all things Parliamentary; nor does Mr. Lecky stand alone among critics of the House of Commons in the woeful view he takes of the condition of that assembly. In, for instance, a recent number of the *Quarterly Review*, a writer of weight on the "Onslow Papers" paints in strong colours the alleged shocking deterioration which has come over the House. "The House of Commons," he observes, "now contains members who only submit to its rules and regulations because they are obliged, and not out of any moral respect for them; men who see nothing to regret in scenes of anarchy and disorder, because they only bring the time nearer when honest folks will get their own. With all these new germs of turbulence, and this new audience to applied it, we may doubt whether even another Onslow would not find the maintenance of order upon the old system a task beyond his strength." It will be noticed that this writer takes if anything an even more pessimistic view than Mr. Lecky, for if these "scenes of anarchy and disorder" are only "germs of turbulence," what may we not expect when the disease has got a thorough grip of the House? If they do these things in the green tree, what will they do in the dry?

It is a pity the severe critics of the House of Commons of to-day do not, for our guidance, (1) give dates which mark the period when this deterioration in behaviour set in; and (2) depict the House of Commons in its various moods and phases in past times, with the object of enabling us to strike a comparison between the old and the

new condition of things. Nothing is more telling than what is known in journalism as the "deadly parallel." If, opposite these modern scenes of turbulence, of coarse and brutal insult, there could be arrayed scenes of perfect order and instant obedience to the Chair in even the most exciting periods, of scrupulous avoidance of anything in the nature of a bitter allusion or of a word or action likely to cause resentment, the vivid contrast thus afforded might do something to convert even those who hold that the House to-day is an almost ideal assembly. The critics, however, are content, as a rule, to simply lament the deterioration of Parliament in a rather vague and general manner: they desire to condemn what is vicious in the House to-day, without troubling to show what was particularly meritorious under the old system. Perhaps we may regard them, after all, as not so much critics as—like the bitter enemies of the House of Lords—partisans. Mr. Lecky, of course, cannot be so regarded, but is it disrespectful to the historian to suggest that, for once in a way, he has, in his latest work, unconsciously allowed his Lowe-like aversion to democracy to prejudice his judgment of the assembly which that democracy elects to sit at Westminster?

Supposing it be contended that the behaviour of the House of Commons has deteriorated within the last half-century, then the opinion of members whose own Parliamentary careers cover the whole, or a great portion, of that period are naturally of value to those desiring to get at the truth. Amongst such members, few, if any, speak with such authority as Mr. Gladstone. Mr. Gladstone was kind enough not long since to send me a communication, part of which covers a wider field than can be dealt with in this article, but which, notwithstanding, I venture to quote because of its intrinsic interest. "I should say," wrote Mr. Gladstone, "that since I entered the House of Commons in 1832 (1) the moral standard of legislation has been raised; (2) that of personal conduct lowered; (3) that of manners (despite a glaring instance to the contrary some years back) not deteriorated; (4) the respect and deference of the individual members for the House have been greatly lessened." Mr. W.W. Bramston Beach, who may be regarded as Mr. Villiers' successor to the proud position of "Father of the House of Commons," since he has sat for practically the same constituency since 1857, has also favoured me with a few observations on the subject. He considers that, "though in some respects the House of Commons is not equal to what it formerly was," comfort may be derived from the fact that the traditions of the past have been preserved in respect to the authority of the Speaker. "It generally happens," he writes, "that when any scene of disorder takes place the Chairman of Committees is in the chair, and if the Speaker is sent for, his happy influence serves to check and repress it."

Mr. Beach does not seem prepared any more than Mr. Gladstone to assert that the manners of the M.P. have on the whole deteriorated, though he does take some exception to the carelessness which exists in the matter of dress. "Some members pride themselves," he writes, "on their rough costumes and extraordinary hats."

We have heard a good deal during the last few sessions about the discourtesy displayed by some of the "young bloods" towards certain private members who have taken a constant part in the proceedings, and it is impossible for one who has watched the debates to deny that when certain speakers have risen to speak for the third and fourth time during the same sitting, the feeling of oratorical satiety experienced by the House has sometimes made itself painfully clear. Mr. Beach, however, is inclined to think that impatience at an ill-timed and lengthy speech is not now so strongly marked as it used to be, which certainly goes to support Mr. Gladstone's opinion that the standard of Parliamentary courtesy has not been lowered. According to Mr. Pleydell Bouverie, a former Chairman of Committees, there existed in the middle of the present century a practical closure of a debate "in the loudly proclaimed unwillingness of the House to listen to unwelcome speakers and speeches. Inarticulate noises of a full House were irregular, no doubt, in form, but were efficient in practice to close a debate."¹ C. H. Townsend, in his *Memoirs of the House of Commons*, published shortly before the middle of the century, complains of very disorderly interruptions. "Discord in all its varieties of inharmonious sound (the note of the goose excepted), sharp recriminations and bitter personalities, the loud buzz of conversation and laughter as at a club, carelessness in dress and demeanour render St. Stephen's Chapel more disorderly than becomes the first assembly of gentlemen in Europe." "Striking in the House," he is glad to say, is "an offence now unheard of, hissing has gone out, and smoking is confined to its proper sphere." One cannot help thinking that had our Parliamentary pessimists lived at the time of which Townsend wrote, and observed what he has placed on record, they would have taken a very despairing view of the behaviour of the House of Commons, and have declared it to be distinctly on the downward grade. It is no doubt quite true that at that period striking in the House was an unheard-of offence; yet "scenes" did occasionally take place then and earlier, which, if occurring now, would be described as furious. The memorable one in which Brougham heaped invectives on Canning, and Canning retorted with the lie direct, so that it seemed likely for a while that both leaders would have to be placed under arrest by the Sergeant-

¹ It was this loudly proclaimed unwillingness of the House to hear him properly that drove Mr. Chisholm Anstey to the device of moving the adjournment, a plan never adopted before under similar circumstances.

at-Arms, might be adduced.¹ Would not such a scene to-day, between a leader or ex-leader of the House and another Front Bench man, be voted a shocking scandal?

But, it may be objected, this is not necessarily the period which critics have in mind when they dwell on the decadence in House of Commons behaviour. What, then, is the particular period? Onslow was a great Speaker, yet during the century in which he flourished a firm hand must often have been very necessary. "I censured the coarse invectives," says Boswell, "which were become fashionable in the House of Commons, and said that if Members of Parliament must talk of each other personally in the heat of debate, it should be done more genteelly. 'No, sir,' replied Johnson, 'that would be much worse. Abuse is not so dangerous when there is no vehicle of wit or delivery—no subtle conveyance. The difference between coarse and refined abuse is the difference between being bruised by a club and wounded by a poisoned arrow.'" "Scenes" in those times were neither so frequently nor so graphically brought to the notice of the public as now, but we get here and there a glimpse of Mr. Speaker's difficulties.

"Pray, gentlemen, be orderly," pleaded Sir Fletcher Norton from the chair (December 12, 1770.); "you are almost as bad as the other House,"—there had been an angry outbreak in the House of Peers owing to the Mutual Exclusion dispute. There is no need to go back to the "roaring times" when Hollis called Ireton out of the House to pull his nose, and when rowdyism, indeed, was almost as much the order of the day inside as outside Westminster: nobody can pretend we have degenerated in our Parliamentary manners as compared with then.

That the system of warfare devised by Mr. Parnell, "the sacred right of obstruction," as he called it, and that the weapon Parliament was compelled to forge to combat that system, have had their evil effects is not to be denied. "All-night sittings," said Mr. Peel in 1887, "destroyed life, shattered the nerves, and soured the temper;" and after "all-night sittings," he might have added, "the deliverance of 3828 speeches by Irish members in the course of a single session of 154 days." To talk and write, however, as though Parliament were habitually the home of something like an organised resistance to order and of a contempt for the courtesies of debate, and as though honourable understandings were no longer possible between men or parties therein, is to greatly misrepresent the existing state of things; whilst to dolefully bewail the decadence which is alleged to have taken place in respect to the manners and bearing of the average Member of Parliament is to take for granted an ideal assembly

¹ Mr. Canning's words in effect said: "You shall either fight me or retract."—*Lord Brougham's Opinions*. Published by Colbourne. 1832.

in the past that as a matter of fact does not seem to have existed. Grattan's historic threat has happily not yet been fulfilled, and the House of Commons is no disgrace to those who elect it. Probably, as Townsend observed, "Parliament, as the radius not less than the type and shadow of the spirit and intelligence of the people—reflecting that spirit and directing that intelligence—must be refined or coarse, chivalrous or rustic, in proportion as the standard of public manners and morals is exalted or low."

GEORGE A. B. DEWAR.

OVER THE BORDER.

"COME up, Mister! The stairs is steep; but 'old 'ard to the rope, and you'll be all right."

I held hard to the rope, and presently emerged breathless into the light of the sick-room. I was received by a girl with kiss-curls all over her forehead.

"My mate's that bad," she explained, "that I thought as 'ow 'e oughter see the parson. Yus; you think 'e's young to be an 'usband; but, I'm 'is second, although 'e's not three-and-twenty yet; an' there's two—a boy and a gal—by the fust.. It's precious 'ard on me, I can tell yer, as 'as to go to work day after day, to come 'ome an' find 'im always layin' there, not able to do nothink—not from the day we was married. Little I thought, wen he come a-courtin' of me—'Liza, won't you tike care o' my motherless kids?'—as 'ow I'd 'ave to tike care o' 'im too, an' feed the lot. An' mother 'll tell yer the same."

Here I became aware of the presence of a fat and exceedingly dirty woman, who noiselessly slid off her chair, bobbed and smirked, and noiselessly slid back again.

"Wot my darter says," she observed hoarsely, casting her eyes to the fly-blown ceiling, "is only too trew. She 'as been 'eavily tried—'eavily."

The sick man lay stonily still save for his laboured breathing. His sunken eyes, hollow cheeks, parched lips, tense nostrils, all told one tale—that the end was not far off.

"And what does the doctor say?" I inquired.

"Says as 'ow 'e can't last." The girl flattened a refractory little curl with the palm of her hand. "Too fur gorn! Not as 'e tells 'im so; but wen mother goes dahn to the door, 'e says, says 'e, 'Opeless! No good me comin' no more; it's on'y a matter o' time——' There! 'E's groanin' agin; an' no wonder, wi' that stuff on 'is stummick! That there, in the glass, ain't rum, Mister, but vinegar to break the goggles. Why, 'e never gits a wink o' sleep all night—cawfin', cawfin', cawfin', till you'd fink 'e'd cawf 'isself inside aht."

Lightly laying my hand on that of the sick man, I whispered words of consolation and encouragement. His white, drawn face was not a yard from mine; and, thus close, it seemed to me that

there was a great fear in his eyes. I suppose I betrayed my thought.

"Yus, 'e's afraid," said the girl, resting a plump bare arm on the mantelpiece, and glancing over her shoulder at her distorted reflection in the mirror behind her. "'E's mortal afraid, that's wot 'e is. I tells 'im 'e ain't got nothink to be afraid on; for 'e was never wot you call a right dahn bad 'un—a cussin' an' a drinkin' lout as you may see by the dozen if you puts your nose 'arf a inch ahtside the door. An' if 'e'd 'a 'ad 'is 'ealth, 'e'd 'a done the right thing by me, I dessay; though, 'e knows as well as me, as I could 'a 'ad Elf Stannard an' thirty bob a-week for the 'oldin' up o' my little finger."

The sick man was making agonised efforts to speak, and the sweat was standing in beady drops on his forehead. I tried to picture him in the hey-day of his health, brutal and coarse doubtless, but with a certain worshipful force about him to which this girl had unconsciously bowed down. But the strength had vanished, and the worship had ceased, giving place to indifference and contempt.

"It's like this 'ere, Mister. 'E was brought up to Sunday-school an' church an' that; but wen 'e goes to work, o' course 'e thinks 'e's too old by a long chalk for religion, an' chucks it. But as soon as the goggles gets into 'is frote, an' 'e's gripped with that there pollonia,¹ wy, 'e just funks; an' 'is frightened eyes foller me abaht the room till I feel I must jump aht o' the winder and end the whole bloomin' business. 'E's fair afraid to die, an' that's the long an' short of it."

"My darter says nothink but the stark trewth," observed the fat woman; "an' if the good gen'leman 'as a ticket for a bit o' meat, or even for a little grocery—not as I would beg, 'avin' always been a respect'ful woman, an' kep myself to myself——"

It was terrible to witness the sick man's struggle for breath and speech; and, for the first time, it occurred to me that the fear in his eyes was not craven, but noble and exalted—the fear, rather, of doing a wrong, or of leaving a right undone, than of suffering the penalty of sin or neglect. I was slowly turning over the leaves of my *Pastor in Parochial*, trying to hit on a suitable prayer, when a sudden exclamation from the girl made me look up. Her face was alive with feeling; contempt, indifference, sullen resentment had all instantaneously vanished. The man was half out of bed, his lean arms outstretched, his lips forming the syllables, "Li-za! Li-za!" She pressed her left hand over her breast, took two short steps forward, then another, and, after a long pause, yet another; and there they were, locked in each other's arms, wrapped in the rosy memory of that gay little wedding from the *Dover Castle* six short months ago.

¹ Vernacular for 'pneumonia.'

"Love yer? Yus, I always did love yer. An' I'm a bad, selfish gal to torment yer so. But forgive me! Jack, ole pal, say you forgive me! Let's part frens. . . . Wot's that? 'Marry Elf Stannard?' Not if I knows it! Wy, wot do yer tike me for? . . . Eh? I can't 'ear. Come closer, mate! There! So! With your 'ead on my 'eart. Comfy, ain't it? Now! . . . 'I *must* marry Elfred?' 'For the sike o' the kids?' Bloomin' rot! . . . Wot? '*You'll die 'appy if I promise?*' Lord! Well then, ole chap, I——"

There was a choking sob, and the sound of a kiss. Then I saw the dying man's head fall backward as it lay on his wife's bare plump arm, and for the first time I heard his voice—

"I ain't—afraid—to die—now—s'elp me Gawd!"

X. WRAIGH.

MR. HENLEY AND HIGHLAND MARY.

THE *Centenary Burns*, edited by Messrs. W. E. Henley and T. F. Henderson, the fourth and last volume of which was published recently, will doubtless take a leading place among editions of the poet's works; but many Burns students, serious and otherwise, will sympathise with the wish that the co-editors had proceeded to collaborate on a biography of the poet. What might we not have learned, or been obliged to unlearn, if Burns's life-history had been fully dealt with by the critics who have hunted his rhymes and metres and raw material from pillar to post until their very birth-places were laid bare to the world. It is true that this fourth volume contains an essay on the poet by Mr. Henley; but Mr. Henley, like R. L. S. and a few more, seems to have been content to adopt the statements of any and every biographer without inquiring too closely into the truth of such statements. This, at least, is the case when he comes to deal with the celebrated Highland Mary.

"Little that is positive is known of Mary Campbell," says Mr. Henley, "except that she once possessed a copy of the Scriptures (now very piously preserved at Ayr), and that she is the subject of a fantasy in bronze at Dunoon. But to consider her story is, almost inevitably, to be forced back upon one of two conclusions: either (1) she was something of a lightskirt, or (2) she was a kind of Scottish Mrs. Harris." On which the obvious comment is: (1) that nobody knows whether Highland Mary's name was Campbell or MacTartan; and (2) that, even admitting the Ayr Bible as a genuine relic of Burns, there is no proof that it was ever in the possession of Highland Mary at all, whatever her name may have been. Mr. Henley proceeds:

"The theory in general acceptance—what is called the episode theory—is that she was 'an innocent and gentle nursery-maid [thus after Chambers, R.L.S.] in the service of a neighbouring family' (Gavin Hamilton's); that she consoled Burns—*mais pour le bon motif*—for Jean's desertion; that they agreed to marry; that on her departure for the west to prepare for the event, 'Ayr, gurgling, kissed his pebbled shore,' and they exchanged vows and Bibles; and that she died of a malignant fever some few months after her return to Greenock. Another identifies her (on Richmond's authority) with a serving-maid in Mauchline, who was the mistress of a Montgomerie, and had withal such a hold upon Burns that for awhile he was crazy to make her his wife; and some have thought that this may be the Mary Campbell who, according to the Dundonald Session Records,

fathered a child on one John Hay. This last hypothesis is, of course, most hateful to the puzzle-headed Puritans, who cannot, or will not, believe—despite the fact that the world has always teemed with Antonys, each of them mad for his peculiar Cleopatra—that Burns, in his present straits, might very well have been enamoured of a gay girl to the point of marriage. So, for the consolation of these, there has been devised a third, according to which her name was either Mary Campbell or something unknown; but, whatever she was called, she was so far and away the purest and sweetest of her sex—the one ‘white rose,’ in fact, which grew up among ‘the passion-flowers’ of the bard’s career—that she must, had she married him, have entirely ‘rectified’ his character, and have transformed him into a pattern Kirk-of-Scotland Puritan of the Puritans. On the other hand, it has become obvious to some whole-hearted devotees of the Marian ideal that a ‘young person’ of this sort would scarce have been of so coming a habit as to skip with alacrity into Jean’s old shoes, and—shutting her innocent eyes to the fact that Burns, a man notoriously at war with the Kirk, and the seducer of two unmarried women, was at the same time at his wits’ end for cash—consent to cast in her lot with his at a moment’s notice, and with never a sign from the family she was to enter. If she could do that, plainly she could not, except on strong positive testimony, be made to do duty as a white rose among passion-flowers; or if, on some unknown and inenarrable hypothesis, she could, then, says one of the devout, ‘the conduct of Burns was that of a scoundrel.’ This is absurd! So of late (1896-98) there has come into being a wish to believe that either Mary Campbell preceded Armour in the bard’s affections, or the Highland Lassie never existed at all, but was a creature of Burns’s brain: an ideal of womanhood to which his thoughts ascended from the mire of this world—(the world of Ellisland, and Jean, and the children, and the songs in Johnson’s *Museum*)—as Dante’s to his Beatrice of dream. Given Burns’s own habit, and the habit of the Scots peasant woman, there is still no earthly reason for rejecting the episode theory—even were rejection possible—however seriously it reflect upon the morals of the parties concerned. But it is fair to add that the subject is both complicated and obscure. Burns’s own references to his Highland Lassie are deliberately insignificant and vague: for once in his life he is reticent. His statement that she went home to prepare for their marriage is heavily discounted by the fact that he did not introduce her to his family as his betrothed, in no wise prepared for marriage on his own account, never dreamed, except in sporadic copies of verse, of taking her to the West Indies, and was all the while so desperately enamoured of Jean that not by any amount of self-indulgence could he rid his breast of her; by the fact, too, that, if his thoughts went back to his Highland Lassie in after years, his report of the journey is strongly tinctured with remorse. . . . There is Richmond’s statement, as reported by Train. There is the Mary Campbell of the Dundonald Register. There is the certainty that relations there were between Burns and a Mary Campbell. There is the strong probability that Mary Campbell and the Highland Lassie were one and the same person. There is Burns’s own witness to the circumstance that they met, and parted under extremely suspicious conditions. That really is all.”

It is enough—to damn the episode theory. Richmond’s alleged statement “as reported by Train,” and even then at second hand, comes from a tainted source.¹ No doubt there was the Mary Campbell of the Dundonald Registers, but there is absolutely no

¹ See *Highland Mary*, appendix to first vol. of 1896 edition of Chambers’ *Burns*.
VOL. 149.—No. 3.

proof that Burns had "relations" with her. There is no "strong probability" that Mary Campbell and Highland Mary were one and the same person. It was not until the story of the dubious Bible now at Ayr had been published by J. G. Lockhart in his *Life of Burns* that the Burnsiana collectors began to feel at all certain about this heroine's surname. Perhaps Lockhart's statement had the effect of breaking down Mrs. Begg's reserve about the name, just as, a quarter of a century later, Mr. Scott Douglas's investigations "broke down her reserve" about the "true date" of the affair.¹ And the latest theory, set forth with much parade of Masonic lore in the *Glasgow Weekly Herald*,² is that the Bible was "faked," and never belonged to Mary Campbell at all! Mr. Henley is right, in saying that the subject is both complicated and obscure; but he does not seem to have thought it worth his while to notice that the complication and obscurity are due, *not* to anything that Burns ever wrote about Highland Mary, but to the episode theory, the invention of a budding Burns-editor who needed it to square up his notions of chronology, and who, after it was invented, did not hesitate to "garble"—his own favourite phrase—the words of Burns and others in support of it.

At the risk of again being likened to an ostrich (see *New Review* of June last) or worse, I repeat what I practically urged in these pages about a year ago,³ that anti-episodists are not called upon to face the question of obscurity, or secrecy, or mystification, for the simple reason that all that sort of thing is of episodist manufacture—its existence is assumed in order to bolster up the episode theory, itself the grossest of assumptions. Mr. Scott Douglas never produced or even gave a reference to the "notes" enjoining secrecy which he asserted Burns had left, and, of course, he cannot be challenged to do so now. But Mr. Henley is still to the fore—and I hope he will live long enough to see the error of his ways in this matter—and if he would state his authority for saying that Burns witnesses himself that he (Burns) and Highland Mary met and parted under "very suspicious conditions," anti-episodists would have something to work upon. As the case at present stands, for Mr. Henley and his colleague to twit (in the *New Review*) anti-episodists about declining to deal with the question is as reasonable as if they had challenged them to deprive one of the Highland Lassie's clansmen of the bifurcated garment which he did not possess.

Mr. Henley assures us, as we have been already assured in the third volume of the *Centenary Burns*, that the poet "for once in his life was reticent." Was he, indeed? In my former article I pointed out that we have, *under Burns's own hand*, as much informa-

¹ Not a few "serious Burns students" will heartily concur in Mr. Henley's remarks, at page 260 of his essay, on the poet's youngest sister.

² In sundry issues during November last.

³ February 1897.

tion about Highland Mary as of any other of his heroines, and considerably more than we have of some of them. That being so, episodists ought to establish the fact of unusual reticence in this case, instead of calmly taking it for granted and using it to bolster up their precious theory. On the face of it Burns is not unusually reticent. It may be urged that what he does tell about this particular heroine is really very little. Which is true; but the paucity of detail is not unique. A "plentiful lack" of detail is characteristic of Burns's own notes on his love affairs. In most collections of the poet's letters there are three or four epistles addressed "My dear E——." They are love-letters, and there seems to have been a definite offer of marriage made. It is supposed that the lady was one Ellison Begbie; but, in fact, no man really knoweth who or what she was. Burns "for once in his life was reticent"! According to the autobiography, Burns was once jilted, and went nearly mad over it. Who was the jilt? Nobody knows—"for once in his life he was reticent." Take the Clarinda affair, and put aside, as we must, the letters that were written for the lady's own perusal. What, then, remains to show that Burns ever knew such a person as Miss Agnes Craig or McLehose? Nothing but the statement in one of his letters that he was ready to hang himself for a young Edinburgh widow. Now Clarinda was not a widow, and it is really surprising that some ingenious annotator has not built up an awe-inspiring theory on the fact that here Burns seems to have indulged in "mystification and misleading statements." According to Mr. Henley and the episodists, Burns had been making love to Jean Armour for nearly eighteen months prior to the rupture early in 1786. It would, indeed, be mere madness for any episodist to doubt this, because it is one of the "proofs" of the episode theory. Now here are the points—(1) Can any reasonable being, or even any "serious Burns student," believe that a marked man like Burns could go on courting the daughter of one of the leading inhabitants of Mauchline without the said leading inhabitant getting wind of it? (2) Is it credible that father Armour allowed the courtship to go on without interference on his part, assuming that he did know of it? On a just view of the whole circumstances, we must conclude that if old Armour had had any idea of what was going forward he would have put his foot down at once to some purpose. As for the first question, if episodists will face it fairly they will find it as much a case of frying-pan *versus* fire (June *New Review*) as anything those of the opposite camp have to deal with. For, if it be admitted that in a small village like Mauchline—a very hotbed of gossip I am informed it is now—the affair could not be kept secret for anything like eighteen months, there is "room" made for Highland Mary in the Mossiel period, and before Jean comes into the story at all. If it be protested on the other hand that the

love affair might have been kept quite quiet—well, Burns “for once in his life was reticent,” and reticent with a vengeance. This alleged clandestine love affair of about eighteen months duration will have to be very carefully explained away before we can lay much stress on the “reticence” in the matter of Highland Mary.

Mr. Henley practically repeats the statement made in the *New Review* article already referred to that “Burns not only remained stolidly inactive in his preparation (for marriage), but did not even introduce her to his relatives, nor breathe a word to any human soul of the betrothal.” This kind of thing is on all fours with Scott Douglas’s rant about “mystifications” and “misleading statements.” It is true, of course, that up to the time of writing the ring which poor Mary was fated never to wear has not cropped up in Canada or elsewhere; but it may turn up some day along with that “small, plain Bible” which Mary is said by Chambers to have given to Burns. We live in hope. Meanwhile, if I choose to assert (which I do not) that the good resolutions with which Burns entered on Mossgiel Farm were due to his anticipation of marriage with Highland Mary (surname unknown), even Mr. Henley could not contradict me without stultifying himself. My knowledge of what Burns said or did in view of his intended marriage is equal to Mr. Henley’s—and neither of us know anything about it.

By all means let us reject the Mary Campbell tradition, immolate the Bible at Ayr, melt down the “fantasy in bronze” at Dunoon, make building material of the monument at Greenock, reduce all get-at-able Highland Mary literature to pulp, and *for ever more let the story stand as Burns left it.*

ROBERT M. LOCKHART.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

THE inter-dependence of various branches of science has been strikingly demonstrated by the rapidity with which the Röntgen rays have been adapted to surgical applications. Discovered by Dr. Röntgen in the course of his physical researches, these rays have, in the course of a few years, become an indispensable adjunct to every hospital or institution where surgical work is carried on. As in the case of bacteriology, special apparatus is required for the production and application of these mysterious forms of energy, and it is of the greatest importance, both to surgeons and their patients, that the necessary information should be available when required. This has been supplied in a clear and concise form by Dr. Walsh, in his *Röntgen Rays in Medical Work*.¹ In his capacity as hon. secretary of the Röntgen Society of London, Dr. Walsh has had exceptionally good opportunities of becoming acquainted with the most recent forms of apparatus and their applications, and Mr. J. E. Greenhill, who contributes a section dealing specially with the necessary electrical apparatus, has given a good summary of the main physical facts bearing upon the subject. The two chief applications of the Röntgen or X rays in surgery at present are the detection of foreign mineral or inorganic bodies in various parts of the human frame, and the diagnosis of diseases and fracture of the bones. Indications are not wanting that, as our appliances are perfected, we may be able to distinguish some of the softer internal organs. Skiagrams of the heart and of the liver have, under certain favourable circumstances, been obtained, and the frontispiece of the work before us reproduces in a remarkably clear manner the markings of the skin surface of a hand. Such a skiagram of the hand of a criminal would be a valuable addition to the Bertillon system of identification. Into the applications of these rays to anatomy we have not space to enter; those mentioned by the author are highly suggestive, and show what an enormous field for research lies open in this direction.* All medical men who wish to keep up to date in their profession should find space for this work in their libraries.

¹ *The Röntgen Rays in Medical Work*. By D. Walsh, M.D. London: Baillière, Tindall & Cox. 1897.

In many branches of agriculture England has not only led the way, but can even now defy competition with foreign countries. In one department, however, that of forestry, we have still much to learn from our continental neighbours. Whether it is owing to lack of State encouragement or to our land laws, there can be little doubt that the planting of forests in the British Isles is in a lamentably backward condition. Possibly the high prices obtainable for agricultural produce had much to do with the destruction of forests in the past ; but the low value of cereals has brought about a state of affairs which would enable substantial profits to be reaped by the growth of timber upon some of the poorer soils, which would otherwise go out of cultivation. Much useful information on this subject may be found in a small treatise on *Practical Forestry*, by Mr. C. E. Curtis.¹ The author is by no means unduly sanguine as to the financial results obtainable by means of forestry ; but he points out how in many cases the profits of tree-growing may compare favourably with those derived from other crops, while at the same time the quality of the land is improved. To this, the second edition of Mr. Curtis's work, various additions have been made ; but the whole book still maintains its essentially practical character, and will be found especially useful to the owners of large estates and to their agents.

While the main geological features of Great Britain have long since been laid down with considerable accuracy, there is still room for an almost unlimited amount of detail work in connection with the various formations. It is therefore satisfactory to know that a number of careful observers are at work throughout the country placing on record the details of the geology of their immediate neighbourhood. Mr. F. R. C. Reed has recently published a useful *Handbook to the Geology of Cambridgeshire*,² in which many interesting particulars of the local geology of that county are given. Whether the extremely artificial limits of a county are the best for a geological area of study is extremely doubtful ; but as a custom has grown up of dividing otherwise homogeneous areas according to the boundary lines of counties which happen to traverse them, we must not blame the author unduly for the choice he has made. Although the geology of Cambridgeshire is by no means monotonous, yet it is lacking in some of the grander features of that science which attract the student. The palæontology, however, is especially rich in some districts, among which we may mention the Barrington and Barnwell deposits of extinct mammals. In the former locality we have seen bones of extinct pachyderms lying literally in heaps, and even Mr. Reed does not venture upon an explanation of the causes which have concentrated the remains of so many individuals at one spot.

¹ *Practical Forestry*. By C. E. Curtis. London : Crosby Lockwood & Son. 1898.

² *A Handbook to the Geology of Cambridgeshire*. By F. R. C. Reed. Cambridge : University Press. 1897.

The gigantic transported cretaceous mass of Roslyn Hill, near Ely, is still somewhat of an enigma to geologists, and there are a few other special features of interest in the county. The economic sections attached to each chapter will be found generally useful; but their utility would have been enhanced by the addition of a geological map.

A very useful little treatise on Latin epigraphs has been published by Dr. S. Ricci,¹ who is so well known as an authority on antiquities at Milan and Turin. The plan of the work is an essentially practical one, numerous illustrations of inscriptions are given, together with the full rendering of the abbreviations. These abbreviations in Latin inscriptions are a great obstacle to the student, and not the least useful part of Dr. Ricci's work is a copious list of abbreviations with their meanings. We can strongly recommend this book to the classical student; it would well repay translating into English.

The second volume of *The Tutorial Chemistry*² has just been published. In it the metals are dealt with by Mr. G. H. Bailey, who classifies them in accordance with the periodic system. Theoretically, such a classification may be justified; but an arrangement which places copper and platinum side by side as "noble" metals appears to us to sacrifice many important properties to the one consideration of atomic weight. The theoretical and physical portion of the book is rather more extensive than is usually the case with treatises of this size; but this will no doubt be found of service to students who have neither time or means to consult more elaborate treatises. When we come to the more practical portion of the book, in which each metal is treated separately, one might almost imagine that the work had been written at least ten years ago. For instance, in describing the artificial production of potassium nitrate, not a word is said about nitrifying organisms. Tin amalgam is still supposed to be the source of the silvery coating on glass for mirrors. Sudbury, an important locality for platinum, is omitted from the list of localities, and the chief ore of nickel is ignored. Monazite, the main source of ceria and thoria, is not even mentioned among the minerals from which these earths are extracted. The only gunpowder known to Mr. Bailey is the antiquated mixture of potassium nitrate, charcoal, and sulphur; the new smokeless powders upon which the fate of nations depends are not hinted at.

The illustrations are not of a high class, nor do they represent the present state of things, especially the apparatus supposed to be used for making potassium, and the tower that was used for making

¹ *Epigrafiæ Latinae*. By Dr. S. Ricci. Milan: U. Hoepli. 1898.

² *The Tutorial Chemistry*. Part II.—Metals. By G. H. Bailey. London: W. B. Clive.

ammonia soda when that industry was in its infancy. Should the author ever require a second edition it would be well to submit the proof to some technical chemist who is in touch with manufacturing operations as they are carried on at the time.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

MR. HORATIO W. DRESSER has collected a series of Essays in Interpretation of the Higher Nature of Man, and published them under the title *In Search of a Soul*.¹ Mr. Dresser may be described as an idealist with a tendency to mysticism of a philosophical type. His essays are in a measure an expansion of some thoughts of Emerson's, in fact they might be called Emerson diluted; but he is more distinctly psychological than the seer of Concord, and is disposed to attempt to prove what Emerson was content to affirm. Our author attaches great importance to the action of the sub-conscious realm, in which is worked up the material supplied by the conscious self. The book is eminently thoughtful and instructive, and may be of service to ethical teachers, and we can also recommend it as suitable for perusal in a quiet hour.

Mr. John Trevor, the well-known founder of the Labour Church, has been moved to publish a record of his religious experiences which he calls *My Quest for God*.² Mr. Trevor's earnestness and, if he will pardon us saying so, his sufferings, in the pursuit of a religious idea excite our sympathies; but we cannot but regret that his early peculiar and narrow religious training appear to have made life difficult to a man of his sensitive nature. The book is of course largely autobiographical and is full of episodes of considerable interest, and in it he unfolds with unusual frankness his most intimate experiences. Mr. Trevor after leaving school began life as an architect; after some time, his health failing, he made a journey to Australia in a sailing ship; from there he proceeded to America and entered as a student in Meadville Theological College with the idea of settling in the United States as the minister of a Unitarian Society. Circumstances, however, brought him back to England, and for a time he studied at Manchester New College, then became assistant to the Rev. R. H. Wicksteed at Little Portland Street Chapel; from that to a Unitarian Church at Manchester; but his socialistic sympathies led him to withdraw from the Unitarians and establish a religious organisation upon new lines—the Labour Church, the story of which remains to be told. Such is a brief outline of Mr. Trevor's career up

¹ *In Search of a Soul*. By Horatio W. Dresser. Boston: The Philosophical Publishing Company. 1897.

² *My Quest for God*. By John Trevor. London: "Labour Prophet" office. 1897.

to the present, and as he is still a comparatively young man we hope that he has a useful future before him. The interest of the present book, however, lies in the revelation of his inner experiences and his thoughts on the relation of religion to the Churches, politics, social questions of the times, &c. Mr. Trevor is an ardent rather than an exact thinker and combines in a remarkable degree an enthusiasm for religion and humanity.

Theoretical ethics are of the greatest interest to philosophers, but ordinary people do not always find that they give much assistance to them in everyday life. To meet this deficiency, Professor Henry Sidgwick has published a small collection of *Addresses and Essays on Practical Ethics*,¹ in which much plain wisdom is to be found. The principal addresses are those on "The Morality of Strife," "Clerical Veracity," "Luxury," and the "Pursuit of Culture." We call these the principal because they appear to be of the most vital interest.

In the paper on clerical veracity it appears to us that Mr. Sidgwick is not by any means too severe upon clergymen who have ceased to believe in certain articles of the creeds, which are not ambiguous, but who nevertheless continue to assert their belief in them. Such clergymen can scarcely be said to be acting morally, or that their conduct tends to the promotion of honesty; while in the name of religion they are acting dishonestly. This is becoming every day an increasing difficulty, as there must be a continually growing number of the clergy who are unable to accept the statements they profess. In the particular instance selected by Professor Sidgwick—that of the "virgin birth"—there can be no escape by any non-literal acceptance of the words; they are either true or not, and the priest who declares he believes them, knowing all the time they are untrue, can scarcely expect to escape condemnation. The concluding essay on "Unreasonable Action" deals with deeper questions, and carries us into the sphere of psychology.

The author of *All's Right with the World*² is, as far as we can make out, something of a "psychist," spiritualist, and theosophist—perhaps a Christian scientist; he is a representative of the "new thought"—this also appears to include mind healing, and, in fact, everything. This is Mr. Newcomb's description: "The new thought teaches that all heredity, environment, and interior conditions are controlled by the soul, and that man's life is not governed to the least degree by any outside circumstances. He simply responds to these as they touch the chords of sympathetic vibration within himself. The new thought reveals to him the absolute equities of existence. It shows the objective life as plastic clay moulded at will through the intelligent use of subjective consciousness." Those

¹ *Practical Ethics; a Collection of Addresses and Essays.* By Henry Sidgwick. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1898.

² *All's Right with the World.* By Charles B. Newcomb. Boston: The Philosophical Publishing Company. 1897.

who like this sort of thing will appreciate Mr. Newcomb's book, in which, however, there are some suggestive thoughts.

Two lectures on the *Sayings of Jesus*, recently discovered at Oxyrhynchus, come to us in a neat pamphlet form from the Clarendon Press. The first lecture, on the "Interpretation of the Text," is by the Rev. Walter Lock, D.D., and sets out the various possible meanings of the most obscure passages in a clear light on the much debated passage: "Raise the stone and there thou shalt find Me; cleave the wood and I am there." Dr. Lock inclines to accept the view that it refers to the universal presence of Christ in nature. We prefer the suggestion of Mr. Barnes, that it is an obscure reference to the crucifixion and burial of Christ. But it is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. Dr. W. Sanday's lecture is on the "History and Origin of the Sayings." The lectures are prefaced by a bibliography, and the text with emendations and illustrations. The pamphlet is indispensable to every English student of the "Sayings."

The author of the *Anglican Reformation*,¹ Dr. William Clark, confesses that the story of the Anglican Reformation has been told so often that no new writer can claim to have anything fresh to relate. Dr. Clark only lays claim to having endeavoured to state the facts with the greatest possible impartiality; but in this surely he is not original, every historian claims the same. William Cobbett and the author of the *Dynamics of Religion* would not confess to partiality, though in their estimate of the Reformation they would seldom be found to agree with the author before us. It is all a matter of point of view; and, as his title implies, Dr. Clark writes from the "Anglican" point of view, which means that he is equally opposed to Romanists and Nonconformists. He contends against the Romanists for the validity of Parker's *Consecration*; and against the Nonconformists he defends the Act of Uniformity of Charles II. The author is not extreme, but partiality is manifest throughout the book.

Mrs. E. L. Butcher, the well-known authoress of a *Strange Journey*, &c., has undertaken a large task in her *Story of the Church in Egypt*,² which is described as an "outline of the History of the Egyptians under their successive masters from the Roman Conquest until now." It is a large field and an interesting one, and Mrs. Butcher has acquitted herself remarkably well in the performance of her labours. The Christian Church, theologically at least, owes a great deal to the Egyptians, and it may surprise many readers to learn, or to be reminded, that many of the great names of the early Church belong to persons of Egyptian birth. Mrs. Butcher disclaims all theological intentions; but it was impossible for her,

¹ *Eras of the Christian Church: The Anglican Reformation.* By William Clark, M.A., Hon. LL.D., D.C.L., F.R.S.C. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1897.

² *The Story of the Church in Egypt.* By E. L. Butcher. In Two Volumes. London: Smith, Elder & Co. 1897.

we suppose, to avoid giving some account of the great controversies of the early centuries and of the persons concerned, such as Origen (who appears to be a favourite of our author), Athanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and others. But after this period the story of the Copts under their Roman, Byzantine, Arab, Kurd, Circassian, and Turkish rulers is well told, and we are led to see how the continual sufferings of this injured race have reduced them to an almost insignificant number; and we also see how their isolation from the rest of Christendom has arrested their religious development, and they are now a peculiar, narrow, and superstitious church, though in some respects no worse than the greater and more orthodox churches.

The Gospel Catechism (Williams & Norgate) is described as an Unsectarian Christian Primer. It contains above two thousand questions on the contents of the Gospels, the answers of which are given in the words of the Gospels—and that is all.

Bright Thoughts: Text-Book for every day of the Church's Year, by Louisa Brockman (Digby, Long & Co.) is a collection of verses of irregular form and very good orthodox sentiment, which is scarcely likely to supersede the *Christian Year*.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

THE great event in the history of the Royal Society of Canada for the year 1896 was the preparation for a fitting commemoration of the discovery of the mainland of North America by John Cabot in 1497. The Society came to the conclusion that the landfall of Cabot was most probably the easternmost cape of Cape Breton, and accordingly it was decided to hold the annual meeting of the Society at Halifax, and to erect an obelisk on the brow of the hill overlooking the mouth of the harbour at Sydney. Thus, in the *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, second series, Vol. II.,¹ for the year 1896, we find a most interesting paper upon the voyages of the Cabots in 1497 and 1498, by Dr. S. E. Dawson, in which the writer seeks to confirm his opinion expressed in a former paper that the weight of evidence is in favour of the Cape Breton theory of Cabot's landfall.

Amongst other valuable papers in the section devoted to English literature, history and archæology is Dr. Bourinot's "Constitution of the Legislative Council of Nova Scotia." Valuable as this contribution is, it does not quite come up to that high standard of treatment to which we are accustomed in constitutional theses from Dr. Bourinot's pen. Another interesting paper is the "Death of Sir Humphrey

¹ *Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*. Second Series, Vol. II. 1896. Ottawa: John Durie & Son; Toronto: The Copp-Clark Co. London, England: Bernard Quaritch. 1896.

Gilbert," half-brother of Sir Walter Raleigh, by Dr. Douglas Brymner. Gilbert, it appears, was lost on the return voyage in the *Squirrel*, of ten tons burden.

In the French section, "Le Gentilhomme Français et la Colonisation du Canada, by M. Léon Guérin, calls for special mention. The Society has also taken a special interest in the proposed change from astronomical to civil time. A thoughtful paper, entitled "The Unification of Civil, Nautical, and Astronomical Time," by Mr. G. E. Lumsden, accordingly finds a place in Section III. Geologists and biologists are catered for in Section IV., which contains some highly specialised papers. These publications are of great value in preserving monographs, which in pamphlet form are so expensive to produce and so readily lost.

The more one studies politics in our independent colonies the more extraordinary does it seem that Englishmen in England should be content with political conditions to which an Englishman in a colony would not submit for ten minutes. *Australasian Democracy*,¹ by Mr. Henry De R. Walker, is good wholesome reading for weak-kneed English politicians. Of course, the circumstances in the old country and in the colonies are widely different, but whilst making all due allowances for these, there is not that disparity in social conditions which should result in placing the colonies decades ahead of the old country in political matters. Mr. Walker's excellent summary of the great political questions which have been settled or are now agitating the various States in Australia and New Zealand, ought to serve as a bracing tonic to those timid English Liberals who are always wanting to mark time or to slow down the march of progress. Mr. Walker shows how the alliance between Liberalism and Labour in South Australia has delivered that State from the throes of depression and revived its original prosperity. In New South Wales there is payment of members, manhood suffrage, and taxation of land values, the probable abolition of an Upper House and the establishment of the referendum; in New Zealand a land system which, if not yet perfect is yet superior to any other in existence. It seems the fate of Upper Houses, however democratic the institution, to be the representatives of vested interests. Thus, in Victoria and Tasmania conflicts between the two Houses exist as in New South Wales. In New Zealand again the Labour party obtained a compulsory Conciliation and Arbitration Act, which is worthy of our close attention in this country.

This is a book that may be read with pleasure for its interest, and with profit for its information to the political student and reformer. It does not profess to be complete, but only to give the salient features of Australasian democratic life and institutions.

¹ *Australasian Democracy*. By Henry De R. Walker. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1897.

The mere fact that Sir Hugh Owen's Education Acts Manual, entitled *The Elementary Education Acts*,¹ 1870-1897,¹ has now reached the eighteenth edition, is a sufficient indication of the esteem in which this eminently practical work is held. It contains an excellently written introduction, giving the layman a clear and complete account of the constitution of school districts and school boards; of the powers exercised by the local authorities under the Education Acts, 1876 and 1880; of industrial schools; the education of blind and deaf children; of the Voluntary school system, and of Parliamentary grants.

The text then deals with the Education Act, 1870, section by section, with explanatory notes and cases, and with the subsequent Education Acts down to the School Board Conference Act, 1897, in a similar manner.

An appendix containing incorporated Acts; the provisions of the Municipal Elections Act applicable to School Board elections; rules, regulations, and forms imposed and used by the central authorities, together with a copious index, completes this invaluable manual.

From the *Report of the Minister of Education (Ontario) for the Year 1897*² we learn that steady progress is still being made, and that the system of education in the province is found to be highly satisfactory. There has been a very gratifying increase in the number of pupils in the higher forms studying history, geography, and composition, owing, doubtless, to the provisions of 1885, by which Canadian history was made compulsory for entrance to the high schools. Another interesting feature is the fact that the number of pupils receiving instruction in temperance and hygiene has increased from 33,926 in 1882 to 203,434 in 1896. Educationists in this country will find many useful hints in this report.

The *New Zealand Official Year-Book, 1897*,³ fully maintains its deservedly high reputation. In addition to its usual statistical information, it continues its articles on special subjects, such as the land system, taxation, technical education, agriculture, &c. We need scarcely say how much English politicians have to learn from a study of these questions.

The *Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent on the Strikes and Lock-Outs of 1896*⁴ has also been able to give the probable figures

¹ *The Elementary Education Acts, 1870-1897.* With Introduction and Notes. By Sir Hugh Owen, K.C.B., Barrister-at-Law. And an Appendix, containing Incorporated Acts, the Provisions of the Municipal Elections (Corrupt and Illegal Practices) Act applicable to School Board Elections, the Rules and Regulations of the Education Department, and the Local Government Board Orders in Council, &c. Eighteenth Edition. London: Knight & Co. 1897.

² *Report of the Minister of Education (Ontario) for the Year 1897.* With the Statistics of 1896. Toronto: Warwick Bros. & Rutter. 1897.

³ *The New Zealand Official Year-Book, 1897.* By E. J. von Dadelszen, Registrar-General. Wellington, New Zealand: John Mackay. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1897.

⁴ *Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent on the Strikes and Lock-Outs of 1896.* With Statistical Tables. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1897.

for 1897. The figures for 1896 show a marked falling off in the extent and importance of trade disputes compared with 1895, which itself showed a considerable decline compared with any of the three previous years. Owing, however, to the recent great engineering dispute, Mr. Llewellyn Smith has arrived at the conclusion that the number of working days lost in 1897 will be nearly, if not quite, as high as that of 1894, though still far below the figures of 1893, the year of the great coal strike.

The inclusion of these preliminary figures is a smart and creditable piece of work.

The *Ninth Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on Trade Unions*, 1896,¹ shows an immense advance owing to the adoption of a new system of obtaining information. Under the old system a large number of the smaller unions refrained from sending in any reports on account of their dislike to publishing financial statements. Now that the statement of details of funds, income, and expenditure has been limited to a selected number of societies, there has been a ready response to requests for information as to membership, and Mr. Llewellyn Smith has been enabled to supply the returns of 1184 societies for the last five years, as compared with those of 594 societies contained in the report for 1892. Thus the foundation has been laid of a true comparison of trade union growth over a period of years.

* PAMPHLETS.—*La Question Religieuse*,² by Mme. Clémence Royer, is a treatise which will appeal strongly to all lovers of liberty of thought and social progress. The keynotes are that the Roman Catholic doctrine is false, and that by sacerdotal influence over women and the education of children, the people are kept in ignorance, whereby social and political progress are obstructed. The author further insists that religions should no longer be supported by the State, and that all sects should be financially self-supporting. A great opportunity of effecting this, she points out, was missed in 1871, when the concordat was made with the Roman Church. We need scarcely say that most of these reforms are as sadly needed in England as in France.

*Orient et Madagascar*³ is the title of an open letter to M. Clémenceau, by M. Louis Guétant, a working man, upon the evils of militarism in the East and in Madagascar. Although written in a declamatory style, the author's criticisms appear to be well founded and to be no more trenchant than are deserved.

¹ *Ninth Report by the Chief Labour Correspondent of the Board of Trade on Trade Unions*, 1896. With Statistical Tables. London: Eyre & Spottiswoode. 1897.

² *La Question Religieuse*. Par Clémence Royer. Paris: Librairie de l'Art Social. 1898.

³ *Orient et Madagascar*. Lettre ouverte d'un Travailleur à M. Clémenceau. Paris: P. V. Stock. 1897.

Cuisines Populaires et Restaurants Co-opératifs,¹ by M. L. D'Abartigue, is an exceedingly interesting account of the public kitchens at Geneva and Chaux-de-Fonds, and of the co-operative restaurant at Grenoble.

VOYAGES AND TRAVELS.

Life in Afrikanerland as viewed by an Afrikaner,⁴ by an anonymous author who writes under the *nom de plume* of "Cios," is a welcome addition to South African literature. As the publishers say in their "Note," "in order to rightly understand racial conflicts—of all the most bitter—we must put ourselves in an adversary's place in order to arrive at just conclusions." Although the author exhibits throughout this book a bitter spirit of hostility to the English supremacy in South Africa, we think he says not a word too much against the Rhodesian gang and their supporters in this country. We have in these pages again and again reminded our readers of the unjust persecution of the Boers by the English for the last ninety years, a persecution only redeemed by the magnanimous action of Mr. Gladstone after our disastrous defeat on Majuba Hill. We drove the Boers out of Cape Colony; we drove them out of the Free State; we drove them out of Natal; and, finally, when we found their country full of gold, we tried to drive them out of the Transvaal. The Jameson Raid was not supported officially because it failed, and until the suppressed telegrams are produced we hold our judgment in suspense as to the guilty foreknowledge of the Colonial Office.

The first portion of this book is devoted to delineations of Boer life and Boer characteristics; the second is concerned chiefly with the political events which centred round the Jameson Raid. We quite acquit the author of any intention of talking cant. We quite believe in the sincerity of the Boers for their religion. But when the Boers talk in their Old Testament way of God delivering the heathen into their hands it is cant all the same. The morality taught by the Old Testament is of the poorest, and can only be compared in this respect with the jingoism of the Imperialists in South Africa, which the Boers so much despise. The author need not fear for the English people. Already hundreds of thousands sympathise with the Boers, and it only requires books like the present, containing the plain unvarnished truth, to convert the great mass which has been led away by the lies and misrepresentations of the Rhodesian hireling Press.

¹ *Cuisines Populaires et Restaurants Co-opératifs*. Par L. D. Abartigue. Paris: Masson et Cie. 1897.

⁴ *Life in Afrikanerland as viewed by an Afrikaner*. A Story of Life in South Africa, based on truth. By "Cios." London: Digby, Long & Co. 1897.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

Chambers's Biographical Dictionary,¹ in one volume, is a splendid work of reference. Scarcely any name of importance is omitted, though we must humbly suggest that some Irish writer of ability, such as Charles J. Kickham, the novelist, and Callanan, the poet, ought not to have been left out, especially as many inferior Scotch authors are included amongst those whose biographies are given. We would further submit that to refer to Nietzsche as a "madman," as is done in the preface, is misleading. Unhappily that original German writer and thinker has lost his reason, but when his works were written he was sane. These, however, are like spots on the sun. The volume is a treasure-house of information, and every educated man who requires a good compendium of universal biography should procure a copy of it.

The discovery of chloroform is one of the grandest achievements of modern science. The credit of this marvellous discovery is due to Sir James Simpson, and the story of his life will interest many readers who are not specially concerned about medical questions. The volume published by Mr. T. Fisher Unwin on Sir James Simpson, in the series entitled *Masters of Medicine*,² is written in a style that will please even persons of fastidious literary taste. The son of a baker in the village of Bathgate, in Linlithgowshire, Simpson carved out a brilliant medical career for himself by sheer ability and force of character. Perhaps the most fascinating chapter in the book is that which describes the first experiments in the use of chloroform, the effect of which Simpson, with two medical friends, tried on themselves. A niece of Simpson's wife also inhaled the vapour. Subsequently chloroform was used with excellent results in obstetrics. The chemical composition of chloroform was first ascertained in 1835 by Dumas, a French chemist, and Flourens, another Frenchman, tried its effect on animals in 1847. It was in this very year that Simpson began the use of it for anæsthetical purposes.

The volume entitled *The Books of William Morris*³ will be eagerly read by all the admirers of the poet who wrote *The Earthly Paradise*. The introduction, which deals with "The Life Poetic as lived by William Morris," shows how thoroughly Mr. H. Buxton Forman appreciates the dead poet and social reformer. The account of William Morris's various works and the illustrative plates greatly enhance

¹ *Chambers's Biographical Dictionary*. Edited by David Patrick, LL.D., and Francis Hinde Greene. London and Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers.

² *Masters of Medicine: Sir James Young Simpson*. By H. Laing Gordon. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

³ *The Books of William Morris*. By H. Buxton Forman, O.B. London: Frank Hollings.

the value of this volume. As a specimen of finished bibliography it is really admirable.

Haydn is admired as a musician, but the facts of his life are not generally known. In *A Croatian Composer*,¹ Mr. W. H. Hadow gives an interesting biography of Haydn, showing how, while he was a really original genius, the great composer was largely indebted to the peasant tunes of his native country. Mr. Hadow's comparison of Haydn in this respect to Burns is worth quoting: "No one is surprised that Burns should have gathered the Ayrshire peasant songs and transmuted them into gold by the fire of his genius; it is not more wonderful that Haydn should have enriched the treasures of Eisenstadt with metal from his native mines, and, as Heine pertinently puts it, the temple is built by the architect, not by the stone-cutters who supply him with his materials."

Portentous Prophets and Prophetesses,² is a book giving sketches of Madame Blavatsky, Mrs. Besant, Mr. A. P. Synnott, Eliphas Levi, Max Nordau, and Mr. Robert Buchanan. Mr. Alex. Macmillan writes about these celebrated personages in a very readable style.

A biography of Henry Whitehead will not be unacceptable to the many admirers of that excellent clergyman. The Rev. H. D. Rawnsley has written what he modestly calls *A Memorial Sketch of Henry Whitehead*.³ Some of the material in the volume has been supplied by Mrs. Whitehead. The book will interest persons who desire to know what the life of a curate in London is like. Whitehead's sermons appear to have been both learned and practical. It was said of him that "he went to the root of everything." In the appendix a speech of Henry Whitehead delivered in 1874, with the title of "The Experience of a London Curate," is given.

BELLES LETTRES.

*Manoupa*⁴ is a weak attempt to be original at any cost. The story has a certain affectation of realism, and its picture of unlawful love is not very overstrained. But the *dénouement* is wretched, and as a work of fiction it is a failure.

*Revelation*⁵ professes to have been written to maintain the main principles of the Christian faith. The author, Mr. Eric Wyndham,

¹ *A Croatian Composer: Notes towards a Study of Joseph Haydn.* By W. H. Hadow. London: Seeley & Co.

² *Portentous Prophets and Prophetesses.* By Alex. Macmillan. London: Digby, Long & Co.

³ *Henry Whitehead: a Memorial Sketch.* By the Rev. H. D. Rawnsley. Glasgow: Maclellan & Sons.

⁴ *Manoupa.* By Rose Soley. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁵ *Revelation. A Romance.* By Eric Wyndham. London: Digby, Long & Co.

has strained at sublimity, but, like another writer of the day, who has gained notoriety by dragging sacred subjects, without rhyme or reason, into romance—Marie Corelli—he has produced an abortive and rather ridiculous work. Why should novelists neglect human nature, which still supplies inexhaustible material for fiction, and try to make a name by “playing fantastic tricks before high heaven”?

*Philippa's Adventures in Upside Down Land*¹ is one of those little books that has the merit of appealing to infantile minds. There is not much in it, but it is simple and natural. It ought to please children.

*Silver Store*² is a series of delightful mediæval, Jewish, and Scandinavian semi-religious legends by Mr. Baring-Gould. They are told in verse, but we prefer to deal with them as simple tales. “The Devil’s Confession,” from Cæsarius Heisterbachensis, is admirable. So is “The Little Scholar.” Two Talmudical stories, “The Cursing Hour” and “The Rabbi Joachim,” are very beautiful. The verses in which Mr. Baring-Gould has narrated these legends are simple, but full of nervous strength, recalling sometimes the style of Macaulay’s *Lays of Ancient Rome*.

The Latest Fruit is the Ripest,³ by Mr. F. J. Gant, is a brightly written book, giving a popular view of the development of religious ideas. We cannot help feeling that Mr. Gant’s ideas are rather crude, but, assuming that faith in the supernatural is desirable, he puts the case very well. The narrative form which he adopts makes his book all the more readable. This little volume is a sequel to his work entitled *Perfect Womanhood*.

*Through One Man’s Sin*⁴ is a book which may be read without weariness, but it has small merit from a literary point of view. The story turns on the conversion of an erring woman, and it is of the conventional order.

*Owen Tanat*⁵ is a Welsh novel, in which we are introduced to the Welsh dialect on a large scale. The narrative is very ponderous, but not quite uninteresting.

*A Corner Wall Mystery*⁶ is a clever little story of the humorously imaginative type. It will help to while away an hour pleasantly.

*Portuguese Rita*⁷ is a readable volume. The local colouring gives a certain charm to the book, and the author certainly knows something of the subject with which he deals—which nowadays is saying a great deal.

¹ *Philippa's Adventures in Upside Down Land*. A Child’s Story. By L. L. Finlay. London: Digby, Long & Co.

² *Silver Store collected from Mediæval Christian and Jewish Mines*. By S. Baring-Gould, M.A. London: Skeffington & Son.

³ *The Latest Fruit is the Ripest*. By F. J. Gant, F.R.C.S. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁴ *Through One Man’s Sin*. By Hamilton Orton. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁵ *Owen Tanat*. By Robert Rees (Alfred N. Palmer). London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁶ *A Corner Wall Mystery*. By Robert J. Lees. Bristol: Arrowsmith.

⁷ *Portuguese Rita*. By M. P. Gumaraens. London: Digby, Long & Co.

*A Trip to Venus*¹ is one of those astronomical romances or extravaganzas which are now becoming every day more numerous. Perhaps the most marvellous specimen of this sort of literature is Mr. H. G. Wells's *War of the Worlds*. Mr. Munro's book shows a considerable knowledge of astronomy, and, at the same time, much daring imagination. By means of an aerial locomotive four persons are supposed to succeed in reaching the planet Venus. The vegetation, the civilisation, and the character of the inhabitants are described. They are, we learn, a peaceful, affectionate, virtuous, and happy people. They are vegetarians and total abstainers, and their ideal is a life entirely in harmony with nature. Mr. Munro's book will well repay perusal.

*The Gown and the Man*² is a story of the seventeenth century. There is a great deal of "religiosity" in it, and the author evidently knows something about the history of English Puritanism. But as a work of fiction the book is a failure.

Dr. Fritz Rosen's *Modern Persian Colloquial Grammar*³ will be very useful to students of the Persian language. There are a number of dialogues given, and the diary of the late Shah, taken from Mr. Redhouse's work, *The Diary of H.M. the Shah of Persia during his Tour through Europe*, A.D. 1873, will be regarded as an interesting feature. The original Persian, as well as an English translation, of the diary are given.

The Preceptor's French Course,⁴ by Mr. F. Weekly, M.A., is a good elementary book, in which grammatical instruction is combined with useful exercises, enabling beginners to translate French sentences. The book forms a portion of the Preceptors' Series.

In *Margaret Moore, Spinster: Her Love Story*,⁵ Miss Buckland, Member of the Anthropological Society of Paris, has given us a quaint and charming narrative in the style of the eighteenth century. The story is supposed to be told by a farmer's daughter, and a vein of rusticity runs through the narrative, thus rendering it more natural and lifelike. The scenes at Bath are very vivid, especially the description of the troubles occasioned by the exorbitant charges of the sedan chairmen of the period. The character of Margaret Moore's deceitful lover is not as well portrayed as it might have been. His villainy is too obvious, and this portion of the story appears to us to wear an air of improbability. The book, however, has very considerable merit as a work of fiction, and it exhibits that faculty, unhappily too rare amongst the novelists of our time—the power of telling a story properly.

¹ *A Trip to Venus*. By John Munro. London: Jarrold & Son.

² *The Gown and the Man*. By Prester T. John. London: Digby, Long & Co.

³ *Modern Persian Colloquial Grammar*. By Dr. Fritz Rosen. London: Luzac & Co.

⁴ *The Preceptor's French Course*. By Ernest Weekly, M.A. London: W. B. Clive.

⁵ *Margaret Moore, Spinster: Her Love Story*. By A. M. Buckland. London: Downey & Co.

The style of the talented lady who writes under the name of John Oliver Hobbes has been justly admired. Her latest work, *The School for Saints*,¹ is, perhaps, the most elaborate of her productions. It has many passages of great power and beauty, but, as a novel, it is not exactly successful. Its characters seem like puppets, and we have a painful consciousness while reading the book that it is the authoress who is really speaking in the various dialogues, and not the imaginary persons who figure in the novel. The opening chapters, from the standpoint of pure fiction, are the best, in spite of their unreality. The introduction of Disraeli, before he became Lord Beaconsfield, into the story is a blunder. There is great wealth of epigram and much worldly wisdom in the volume, but Robert Orange, Henriette Duboc, Parflete, Brigit, and Lady Fitzrewes impress us with a curious sense of their non-existence save on paper. If the authoress, instead of striving to impress us with her cleverness, had aimed at simplicity and naturalness, the result might have been different. As it is, the hero of the book, with all his goodness, must be pronounced an insufferable prig, and the saintly Brigit must be regarded as a rather undesirable acquaintance. The method of constantly quoting Robert Orange's diary does not add verisimilitude to the narrative, for here, too, we realise that the epigrammatic touches are part of John Oliver Hobbes' literary stock-in-trade. In fact, our impression as to the entire book might be thus summed up: it is admirably written, but it can scarcely be called a novel at all.

*The Albany Depot*² and *The Unexpected Guests*³ are two additional little volumes of Mr. W. D. Howells, each of which he describes as a "farce." They are full of humour and originality, and might be used for acting purposes so as to afford much amusement. A delicate power of characterisation is at the same time revealed in these charming booklets.

ART.

DURING the past two years we have had occasion to notice, with ever increasing pleasure, the issue of the successive volumes of *English Minstrelsie*⁴—a collection which proposes to include the favourite songs of all classes of the English people during three centuries up to 1840. The concluding volumes (vii. and viii.) are

¹ *The School for Saints*. By John Oliver Hobbes. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

² *The Albany Depot*. By W. D. Howells.

³ *The Unexpected Guests*. By W. D. Howells. Edinburgh: David Douglas.

⁴ *English Minstrelsie*. A National Monument of English Song. Edited by S. Baring-Gould, M.A. Edinburgh: T. C. & E. C. Jack. 1897.

now at hand, with the highly interesting "introductory essay on English Folk-music" by the editor, and the usual abundant selections of songs rescued from oblivion, annotated with spicy bits of history, and arranged for the musicians of an age too often satisfied with the music-hall products of the present. The Adieu of Mr. Baring-Gould, at the close of his important work, expresses the musical and literary, as well as the patriotic idea:

"It has not been easy to resolve what to include and what to reject; there is such an *embarras de richesse* in English song. . . . At the time when the later volumes of *English Minstrelsy* are appearing, the attention of musicians is turning to the more robust and healthier creations of a still earlier period (than the beginning of this century); and the editor rejoices to think that this is the case, and trusts to assist towards the improvement of the degenerate taste which delights in flabby, idealess song, such as has held the public ear for nearly forty years, and to direct it to the limpid, sparkling, and pure springs of early English minstrelsy."

"Britannia's sons, rejoice,
To George exalt your voice,
God save the King!
In whose auspicious reign
Cape Breton we regain,
And in recording strain
Victory sing.

"Oh, grant that, nobly won,
That never Cape Breton
Again may fall.
May British hands protect
While British hearts direct,
And Gallic schemes detect!
God save us all!"

We have received the album of plates and pages selected from the second volume of the monumental work published by Mr. Batsford—*Modern Opera Houses and Theatres*.¹ We noticed at length the character of this work at the appearance of the first volume. Its interest and value do not lessen as it proceeds. The present volume (to show the completeness and perfection of the work) contains the following illustrated examples: at Paris, the National Opera House and "Opéra Comique" now building, and the "Eden," which has disappeared; the Casino at Monte Carlo; in Italy, theatres at Palermo, Milan, and Turin; at Bilbao, in Spain; in Austria-Hungary, the Court Opera House and a theatre from Vienna, the Czech Theatre at Prague, and others from Salzburg and Laibach; in Germany, examples from Frankfort, Essen, Rostock, Bromberg, and Berlin; in Great Britain, five from London, and others from

¹ *Modern Opera Houses and Theatres*. By Edwin O. Sachs, Architect. London: B. T. Batsford. 1897.

Stratford-on-Avon, Leeds, and Cambridge ; from Athens in Greece, Rotterdam in Holland, Bucharest in Roumania, and from Geneva and Zurich in Switzerland. On the Paris Opera House nine large plates are given, with eight illustrations in the text ; on the Opéra Comique, five plates, with a plan and general view in the text. "In no previous publication have architects of theatres placed their full working drawings at the disposal of an English author."

Mr. Sachs, who is responsible for this work, has fulfilled the promise which he made at the beginning. "In compiling these volumes endeavour has been made to combine the advantages of an atlas and a text-book, which will not only afford information to the specialist, the architect, and engineer, but also to the theatre-lessee, the playgoer, and critic, and to public authorities and their officials." The place of such a work is clearly marked out in all general libraries and collections.

"To those who know nothing of stained glass ; to those who know something, and want to know more ; to those who know all about it, and yet care to know what another may have to say upon the subject—I dedicate this book."¹ The author who writes this is Mr. Lewis F. Day, whose praise as a writer of books on ornamental art is in all the churches of art-lovers. More, perhaps, than any recent art-writer, he has the requisites for his task—experience as a practical ornamentist, and the habit of teaching. We are not surprised to learn, from the modest preface to his new book, that he has an altogether special fitness for writing about stained and painted glass in *Windows*. "My earliest training in design was in the workshops of artists in stained glass. For many years I worked exclusively at glass design, and for over a quarter of a century I have spent a great part of my leisure in hunting glass all Europe over. . . . I have gone to glass to get pleasure out of it ; to learn something from it ; to find out the way it was done, and why it was done so, and what might yet perhaps be done." Mr. Day disclaims "learnedness" or any sort of competition between his more practical and, in a sense, popular volume and the learned writings, with minuter and more precise historic information, of Winston, Mr. Westlake, and the many Continental authorities. But we prophesy that artists and amateurs alike will henceforth go to Mr. Day for their grounding.

The book is a convenient octavo volume of 415 pages, well printed and indexed, with abundant illustrations from historic examples, both in the text and inset plates. As coloured illustrations of stained glass are out of the question, the *effect* of glass is suggested by process renderings of photographs from actual windows, or from very careful water-colour drawings. Details of *design* are seen in the reproductions of tracings or slight pen-drawings, done to illus-

¹ *Windows : a Book about Stained and Painted Glass*. By Lewis F. Day. London : B. T. Batsford. 1897.

trate a point. The direction of the pen-lines gives, wherever it is possible, a key to the colour scheme, according to heraldic custom. The material part of the book has thus been made adequate to its purpose.

In treating his subject, the author's point of view is "workmanship and art, workmanship being naturally the beginning and root of art." In Book I. he traces the course of *workmanship*, following the technique of the workman from the twelfth century to the seventeenth, from mosaic to painting, from archaism to pictorial accomplishment. This is done in chapters whose titles show their general interest: "The Beginnings of Glass," "The Making of Windows," "Glazing," "Early Mosaic Windows and Painted Mosaic," "Glass Painting, Mediæval and Renaissance," "Enamel Painting," "The Needle-point in Glass Painting," and, by way of recapitulation, "The Resources of the Glass-worker." Book II. shows the course of *design* in glass, from the earliest Mediæval window to the latest glass-picture of the Renaissance. Book III. is given up to the characteristics of *style* in glass and to other such interesting questions "by the way"—as how to see windows, windows worth seeing, and a word on restoration.

In sum, the book is pleasant reading and highly instructive. So far as we know, it is the first book which makes it easy for the general student of art history to complete his information on an integral part of the monuments of the great periods of Western art. It is not only the visitors to cathedral chapels and museums that will find a new world of artistic intelligence opened up to their observation. Readers of Ruskin will see more clearly what their strained gaze has hitherto been ineffectual to grasp. It is not blasphemy to say that Mr. Ruskin's own observation would have profited by the knowledge conveyed in Mr. Day's book, which is a model work of art instruction for wise and simple alike.

The *Comparative Architecture*¹ of Messrs. Fletcher has gone through two editions in fifteen months, and become a text-book in Great Britain and Ireland, America and Australia—an enviable record for a book of its kind. In this third, revised edition some slight errors have been corrected, some additions to the letterpress have been made, treating more fully certain points which it was thought required emphasising, and two plates of Classic and Gothic mouldings have been added. We can only repeat the praise given here on the first publication of this unique application of the "comparative method" to rendering generally intelligible the historical styles of architecture. We look forward with interest to the volume announced by the authors, which will apply the same method to styles "non-historical."

¹ *A History of Architecture on the Comparative Method.* By Professor Banister Fletcher and Banister F. Fletcher. Third Edition, revised. London: B. T. Batsford. 1897.

Nearly every British pottery known to amateurs had long since its complete monograph, with the exception of "Swansea china." Mr. William Turner has supplied the want by his large, richly illustrated volume on *The Ceramics of Swansea and Nantgarw*¹: "a history of the factories, with biographical notices of the artists and others, notes on the merits of the porcelains, the marks thereon, &c.; also an appendix on the mannerisms of the artists by Robert Drane, F.S.S." The primary interest of such a volume is for the collector, to whom it is precious indeed. It is illustrated—thirty-three inset plates—by one of the latest developments in art ceramics, namely, coloured collotypes, in order to show the "mannerisms" of the artists, so as to protect the collector and connoisseur. There is so much difficulty in reaching the real public of such a book that the words of Mr. Drane are worth quoting: "I think the price, £1 11s. 6d., is fixed too low to subscribers, for if it had been £2 2s. there is not a collector who knows his business but must feel that he might easily without this book be deluded by some one or other of the forgeries with which the market abounds, and in a single purchase lose more than its price."

But there is a larger public that may profit by this work—the buyers of art-books for their own sake and patriotic readers of art-history. Perhaps the French Academician who, in his *obligato* parallel, found Romans and English alike without philosophy and art, would have felt remorse on learning that Swansea ware has been mistaken for the *pâte tendre* of Sèvres. Also, he might reply: "It is Cambrian—Celtic—not English!" Without subtle distinction, this book belongs to our national history.

¹ *The Ceramics of Swansea and Nantgarw*. By William Turner, F.S.S. London: Bemrose & Sons. 1897.

THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CXLIX. No. 4.—APRIL 1898.

LEADERSHIP AND PREMIERSHIP.

THE Liberal party is apparently no nearer to a settlement of the question of leadership than it has been any time since the resignation of Lord Rosebery in October 1896. Sir William Harcourt, so far as he is leader at all, has become more and more *un roi fainéant*, and on the other hand Lord Rosebery has since the opening of Parliament shown on several occasions a disposition to return to the active work of the political arena. Meanwhile, as Mr. George Russell says, some are of Paul, some of Cephas, and others of Apollos; and the proposition—first put forward, I believe, by Lord Tweedmouth—that the matter should be left in abeyance until the time comes for the leadership to take the concrete form of the premiership, still appears to hold the field. But, apart from the inconvenience to the party in the interregnum, this is a course to which several objections may be taken. One of these is, that there are good grounds for supposing that the Queen would view with great disfavour the action of a political party in deliberately placing upon her shoulders the task of adjudicating upon rival claims to the leadership. There is more in this objection, as I shall presently show, than in another which has been gravely urged in opposition to Lord Tweedmouth's suggestion, namely, that the nomination of the next Premier will, in the absence of a candidate of overwhelmingly strong claims, be practically in the hands of Lord Salisbury. One of the most pretentious of the weekly papers informed its readers not long since that "the outgoing Premier advises the Sovereign to send for a statesman on the other side, who forms a Government if he can." This statement is founded upon an entirely erroneous view of the function of the Crown in times of political crisis.

It need scarcely be said that from the death of George II. until the accession of Victoria it would not have been possible to imagine.

any one presuming to dictate to the Sovereign who should be Prime Minister. Indeed, the control of the Minister even over his own subordinates was during this period much less complete than in our days. It is beyond doubt that the power of appointment and dismissal of any of the Ministers still rests with the Crown, but it has become a part of our mysterious unwritten Constitution that in the case of a subordinate office the power must be exercised on the advice of the Prime Minister. The Queen allowed a precedent to be established in 1851 which practically settles this point. It will be apparent to any reader of Mr. Spencer Walpole's *Life of Lord John Russell* (vol. ii. pp. 135-8)—and there is further evidence in the *Life of the Prince Consort* and the memoirs of the Duke of Coburg—that the Queen came to the conclusion in November 1851 that Lord Palmerston ought no longer to remain Foreign Minister. At her Majesty's request, certain correspondence on the subject of Palmerston's "indiscretions" was laid before the Cabinet at that time, obviously with the object of obtaining a decision which would justify his dismissal. The Ministers declined to pronounce judgment on the conduct of their colleague, and Mr. Walpole adds: "However much the Queen may have regretted the decision at which the Cabinet thus arrived, her knowledge of her duties as a constitutional Sovereign was too accurate to suffer her to dispute it. She gave way." The incident is curious, as one would have thought the dismissal, like the appointment, of Ministers, would rest with the Premier through the Sovereign or *vice versa*; at any rate not with the Cabinet, as was practically conceded in this instance. And as a matter of fact the case can hardly be regarded as a precedent, for in the following month Lord John Russell took the matter into his own hands, and when Lord Palmerston, in defiance of the opinion of the Queen and the Cabinet, expressed approval of the *coup d'état* in France, Lord John wrote to him, apparently without consulting any one: "I am most reluctantly compelled to come to the conclusion that the conduct of foreign affairs can no longer be left in your hands with advantage to the country"; and again, "No other course is open to me than to submit the correspondence to the Queen and to ask her Majesty to appoint a successor to you at the Foreign Office." This was done, and Palmerston was dismissed on the advice of the Prime Minister.

But whatever the function of the Sovereign with respect to subordinate Ministers, it is beyond question that, as Mr. Gladstone said in his review of Sir Theodore Martin's *Life of the Prince Consort* (*Gleanings from Past Years*, vol. i. p. 88): "The whole power of the State periodically returns to the Royal hands when a Ministry is changed." Perhaps the most explicit and authoritative declaration on the subject which has been recorded arose out of the Ministerial crisis of November 1845, when Peel tendered his

resignation on arriving at the conclusion that the Corn Laws could no longer be maintained. On the 13th of that month Lord Malmesbury recorded in his diary: "Sir Robert Peel has advised the Queen to send for Lord John Russell, and she has done so." Two days later Lord Malmesbury discovered his error, and he writes that when Peel went down to resign, "his opinion was not asked as to who should be his successor." However, the erroneous view was held by others and obtained currency in the newspapers, and certain conclusions were drawn from it. Consequently, in the following session, Peel, in explaining the circumstances of his resignation and resumption of office, said: "I offered no opinion as to the choice of a successor. That is almost the only act which is the personal act of the Sovereign. It is for the Sovereign to determine in whom her confidence shall be placed."

This is the accepted constitutional theory and practice, and a very little consideration will show that no other would be either reasonable or workable. (Of course, no one can limit the right of the Sovereign to take the opinion of the retiring Minister, or of any other Privy Councillor, on the course she should adopt; but it would be the height of absurdity for one who has lost the confidence of the House of Commons, or of the country, or of his colleagues, or who from any other cause finds himself unable to continue the direction of the policy of his country—to assume the right of nominating the man who shall undertake the task. This is a high act of State resting upon the personal decision of the Sovereign. Not that there is a failure here of the theory of Ministerial responsibility for the acts of the Crown, which is the keynote of the successful working of the British Constitution. The responsibility rests upon the incoming Minister, not only for the act of the Sovereign in conferring the office upon him, but for any exercise of the regal prerogative which may have brought about the change of Government. (See the observations of Sir Erskine May, *Constitutional History*, on the dismissal of Lord Grenville's Ministry in 1807, and of Lord Melbourne's in 1834.) There is no evidence that Queen Victoria has ever sought the advice—in a constitutional sense—of the retiring Minister, though no doubt she has talked over a difficult situation with him—as with Lord Melbourne in 1839, with Lord Aberdeen in 1855, with Lord Derby in 1859, with Lord Beaconsfield in 1880, and with Mr. Gladstone in 1894: At other times she has obtained the opinion of some trusted Privy Councillor not likely to take office himself—as the Duke of Wellington in 1851 and the Duke of Bedford in 1852. In the former case the problem which had to be solved was submitted to the Duke of Wellington by the Prince Consort in a State paper which is referred to in high terms by Mr. Frank Hill in an article on this subject contributed to the *National Review* of April 1892. The Prince's main proposal was, however, eminently impracticable,

being based on the exploded system of leaving one of the chief controversial subjects of the day "an open question" in the Cabinet. The Duke pointed out the impracticability of this, and advised that Lord John Russell and his colleagues should resume office, which was done.

But parties had been in a chaotic condition since the break-up of the Conservative party on the repeal of the Corn Laws, and a Liberal Government could only exist with the aid of the Peelites, who, however, would not coalesce with them. Russell had lost his popularity with the Radicals, who hovered threateningly on his flank; Palmerston had to be thrown overboard, and in turn upset Russell; and when it became apparent that Lord Derby, who took the reins from Lord John in February 1852, could not hold them long, "the Queen felt that the time had come for the formation of a strong Administration. and for closing the unsatisfactory epoch of Government upon sufferance which had resulted from the disorganisation of parties in 1846" (*Life of the Prince Consort*). One of the steps she took to this end is disclosed in a little secret which was told to Greville (*Memoirs*, 2nd series, vol. ii.). The Earl of Clarendon confided to Greville that when he was at Woburn after the elections of 1852, the Duke of Bedford told him "that he had had a confidential communication from Stockmar asking for his advice whom the Queen should send for if the Government was beaten and Derby resigned. Clarendon recommended him to advise Lansdowne and Aberdeen. and he wrote to that effect." Mr. Spencer Walpole states that the Duke of Bedford also consulted Lord John Russell and Lord Palmerston—whose claims to the Liberal Premiership had come into strong rivalry—and that Lord John gave to his brother the same advice that had been given by Clarendon. Thus we see that in circumstances somewhat similar to those now existing in the Liberal party (Palmerston objecting to serve under his late chief, Russell, and the latter perceiving his weakness without adequate support) the Queen sounded the different sections of the Opposition, and, acting on their opinion, she sent for Lord Aberdeen and Lord Lansdowne, who occupied in the Peelite and Whig parties respectively positions similar to those now held by the Duke of Devonshire as head of the Liberal Unionists and Lord Kimberley as leader of the Liberals in the House of Lords. We learn from the *Life of the Prince Consort* that the Queen also took the opinion of Lord Derby when he tendered his resignation. She "told him to send Lord Aberdeen as well as Lord Lansdowne, the Prince telling him that constitutionally speaking it was not necessary that he should recommend any one. . . . The Queen asked him who was likely to form a Government, and he said Lord Aberdeen." The result of all these inquiries and consultations was the formation of Lord Aberdeen's Coalition Government.

This is a very significant instance of the exercise of the royal prerogative, and another occurred on the fall of the Coalition in 1855. The well-meant experiment had not been a success. The "strong Government" which the Queen desired to form lacked the strength that comes from firm leadership, subordination of individuality, and cohesion of purpose. At the end of January 1855 the Government was killed by Mr. Roebuck's motion censuring the conduct of the Crimean War, and it was generally expected that the Queen would ask either Lansdowne or Russell to reconstruct the Liberal-Peelite Ministry; but she at once sent for Lord Derby, the Conservative leader, and her reasons are thus represented by Greville, writing on February 4:

"The Queen has behaved with admirable sense of her constitutional obligations. When Aberdeen took down his resignation, she told him she had made up her mind what to do; that she had looked at the list of the division, and found that the majority which turned out his Government was composed principally of Lord Derby's adherents, and she should therefore send for him. Aberdeen said a few words rather discouraging her, but she said, though Lord Palmerston was evidently the popular man, she thought, according to constitutional practice, Lord Derby was the man she ought to send for."

Lord Derby failed, and thereupon the Queen sent for Lord Lansdowne, and desired him to consult different people as to their opinions and inclinations, and report to her. He did so; "after which, on the same principle which had decided her to send for Derby, she resolved to send for Lord John Russell, his followers having been the next strongest element of the victorious majority." Lord John had left Aberdeen's Government because he could not resist Mr. Roebuck's motion, and his followers had assisted the Tories to carry it. But Russell was quite unable to form a Ministry, and then the task was entrusted to Lord Palmerston, who had all along considered himself *l'inévitable*, and who succeeded in reconstructing the Government without Aberdeen. Perhaps the Court was on this occasion influenced in some degree by the bitter quarrel it had had with Palmerston a few years before; but the course taken appears both intelligible and reasonable, and we know, from Mr. Evelyn Ashley's *Life of Lord Palmerston*, that when he was called in he was treated with the utmost confidence, and no difficulties whatever were placed in his way.

It would not be difficult to parallel the general situation at the present time. Say Mr. Chamberlain resigned, as Russell did, and assisted the Liberals to defeat the Government, as Russell assisted the Tories. The Queen, we may presume, would first send for Sir William Harcourt (or Lord Rosebery), perhaps first ascertaining the opinions of one or two old Liberals as to which it should be—though

there is another precedent, as we shall see shortly, which would doubtless govern her action in this respect. Should a purely Liberal Government be found impracticable, she would probably—following the Russell precedent just noted—send for Mr. Chamberlain (or for the Duke of Devonshire if he had supported Mr. Chamberlain's action), and, in the event of his failure, for a member of the defeated Government, who might be able to reconstruct it, as Palmerston reconstructed that of 1855.

Yet another instance bearing some analogy to the possibilities of the present day occurred before the close of the fifties—a decade rich in constitutional precedent. Derby had come in again, and, on the impending dissolution of his Ministry in 1859, Palmerston and Russell, whose claims to the leadership split the Liberal party into two sections, came to an agreement analogous to that now favoured by Lord Tweedmouth and others. "Both are resolved," wrote Greville (May 26, 1859) "not to quit the House of Commons, and Lord John Russell himself says the primacy must be determined by the Queen herself, and that whomsoever she may send for and charge with the formation of a Government must necessarily be Premier." A few days after this was written a meeting of the Liberal party was held, summoned in the joint names of Palmerston and Russell, and, though nothing definite was settled, an understanding was arrived at to the effect that either would serve under the one who was called upon by the Queen to form a Government. Within a fortnight afterwards Derby was defeated and resigned, and, to the astonishment of the gentlemen who had so complacently made up their differences, the Queen sent for Lord Granville, and nobody else. Mr. Frank Hill, in the article above referred to, says her Majesty was not aware of the understanding between the rivals, but Mr. Walpole states most distinctly¹ that "the Queen was not ignorant of the negotiations which had taken place. She was aware that the somewhat delicate task of awarding the apple of supremacy to one of the two claimants had been referred to her, and . . . she not unnaturally attempted to evade the difficulty by asking both statesmen to serve under a neutral peer." Greville, too, speaks of the mortification of the rivals at being superseded by so young a man "after they had both so publicly avowed their expectation that one or other of them must be sent for, and after having, in what they considered a spirit of self-sacrifice, consented to serve under each other." Palmerston, with great astuteness, at once consented, without reservation, to assist Granville, probably foreseeing his failure; but Russell declined unless he could have the lead of the Commons, as he would not occupy the third office in the State. In a letter to Granville making this stipulation, he said, "I am afraid her Majesty must encounter the difficulty of making a choice."

¹ *Life of Lord John Russell*, vol. ii. p. 315.

Granville thereupon gave up the enterprise, and the Queen made choice of Palmerston, who was Premier till his death.

It would appear from this that the task of deciding between the claims of rival statesmen of about equal standing is not one which her Majesty would willingly undertake, and that, if it is deliberately proposed that she should do so, she might seek safety in a middle course which ignores them both.

The only other case since this which bears upon the present situation is that of 1880, and in some respects it presents a strong analogy. Mr. Gladstone was unquestionably the most powerful man in the Liberal party, but he had, as Lord Rosebery has done, resigned the leadership whilst in Opposition. This resignation was not a matter of which the Queen need take official cognisance, as, of course, the position of Opposition leader is unknown to the Constitution; but she considered it her duty upon that occasion to first call upon the titular leader of the party in the House of Commons, Lord Hartington. That precedent, one may be sure, has not been overlooked by Sir William Harcourt.

The general conclusion to be drawn from the precedents of the Queen's reign appears to be that her Majesty regards herself, at times of political crisis, as supreme interpreter of the will of the nation; that while there are certain constitutional proprieties to be observed, she has practically a free hand—the right and the duty to review the situation all round, and find what she considers to be the *sumnum bonum*. She may call upon the leader of the party which has been most potent in the overthrow of the existing Government, as in 1855 and on most other occasions, or she may entrust the task of forming a Ministry to one who is not a principal leader at all, as she did in 1859. Constitutionally there is nothing to prevent her pitchforking a Marquis of Bute from the Royal household to the head of a Ministry, but in these days such a thing would, of course, be a practical impossibility. Her conception of her duty clearly is that when the captain of the ship of State relinquishes the command, it is for her to take the helm and steer that course which appears to her to give the best promise of smooth water and safe navigation. In coming to this decision, she may take any opinion which she considers worth having, but if advice is asked and given, it is on the distinct understanding that she is under no obligation to accept it. What political parties can do to assist her is to make it quite clear who are their leaders. Is the Liberal party to once more shirk this obligation, and leave to the Queen embarrassment such as she encountered in 1859, or misinterpretations such as followed her action in 1880? Ever since the Reform Act the leadership of the Tory party has been beyond question, except for very brief intervals after the downfall of Peel and the death of Beaconsfield, and the Queen has never been in doubt whom to send for when the time has.

come for that party to take power. The Liberals have probably been less fortunate in having a course marked clear for them ; certainly they have been less successful in perceiving it ; but it is consistent neither with convenience nor with dignity that they should be trusting to the chapter of accidents, or in the last resort to the judgment of the Queen, for a solution of the problem of leadership.

JAMES SYKES.

BACKWARD "LIBERAL FORWARDS."

"THE NEMESIS THAT WAITS ON BROKEN FAITH."

ON Thursday evening, February 3, "the 'Liberal Forwards'"—to use the words of the London *Daily Chronicle*, described by the chairman of the meeting, Mr. G. W. E. Russell, M.P., as "their most consistent champion in the Press"—"again asserted their existence and vitality . . . by a big meeting at Queen's Hall, Langham Place." Among those present were Dr. Clifford, Mr. J. Bryn Roberts, M.P., Mr. S. F. Mendl, M.P., Mr. A. E. Fletcher (editor of the *New Age*), Mr. R. C. Hawkins (secretary of the Eighty Club), and Mr. P. W. Clayden (honorary secretary to the Liberal Forwards).

In his introductory speech the chairman quoted the eloquent words of Mr. Gladstone: "The pain, the shame, and the mischief of the last two years in Eastern policy transcend the powers of any language that I could use concerning them," and, dealing with the Indian troubles, he said, "every morning brings us some fresh tale of gallant English lives sacrificed to the Nemesis that waits on broken faith."

"The proper business of the Liberal Forwards," said Mr. Russell, "was 'to define true patriotism, its rights and duties, and to apply their principles in fearless criticism of foreign and colonial policy'; but when they were animated by a common enthusiasm for a good cause, even though it lay off the direct path of ordinary duty, it was impossible to refrain from giving expression to it. The Liberal Forwards were united in their zeal for the rights of labour—(cheers)—and while the preparations for that meeting were in progress, labour was locked in a life-and-death struggle with the forces of capital. It was frankly impossible for the Liberal Forwards to restrain themselves from uttering a word of sympathy on that occasion with what they believed to be the right side. Since then the forces of labour at home, like the cause of freedom in the East, had suffered a reverse. The more imperative, therefore, was the duty which lay upon each of them to show that he was no fair-weather friend, but, in Scriptural phrase, 'a brother in adversity.' (Cheers.) In the second resolution they affirmed their social creed; and in the third they called upon their fellow-citizens to translate it into practice. Let them go forth from that hall resolved to do what lay in their power for the social salvation of those great masses of their fellow-citizens who had least power to help themselves." (Cheers.)¹

The following resolutions were then submitted, and carried with practical unanimity :

(1) "That this meeting denounces, as fatal to the honour and influence of Great Britain, the policy of the Government, by which Armenia has been abandoned, Greece and Crete ruined, a disastrous war forced upon the people of India, and slavery sanctioned in South Africa."

(2) "That this meeting, while recognising the necessity for such alterations in the law as will ensure the supremacy of the House of Commons and will secure the franchise to all capable citizens, believes that political reforms are chiefly valuable as means towards those great social reforms in which Labour is so vitally interested."

(3) "That this meeting appeals to all Liberals to support, at the forthcoming election for the County Council, the Progressive policy of improving the conditions of life and labour in London."

The foreign and colonial policy of the present Government ought certainly to be denounced as fatal to the honour and influence of Great Britain, for a more fatal and a more dishonourable policy could scarcely be conceived. But does not such a denunciation, coming from the Liberal party, savour somewhat of Phariseism? Does there not always remain the previous question—How came the present Government into power?

"The present Government," says the *New Age* (January 27), which is practically the organ of the Liberal Forwards, "won the election of 1895 by a hypocritical pretence of social reform. They made social reform a stalking-horse. Thousands of voters in the rural districts believed that they should have old-age pensions at once if a Chamberlain-Salisbury Ministry came in. Their disappointment and disgust gave the Liberals their opportunity. Social reform is as attractive now as it was three years ago. It becomes more imperative every year. The Tories will never give it, and the Liberals can and must."

Hark at the pot calling the kettle black! Did not the late Liberal Government win the election of 1892 "by a hypocritical pretence of social reform"? Did not they "make social reform a stalking-horse"? Did not tens of thousands of electors vote in 1892 for the Liberal party on the strength of the Newcastle Programme pledges with regard to the payment of members and election expenses, the abolition of the breakfast-table duties, and the taxation of land values—reforms which might have been introduced in any one of the Budgets of 1893, '94, and '95—reforms which the House of Lords cannot block—reforms, therefore, which the Liberal Government *could have carried if they would, if their pledges had been given in good faith, if they had meant business?* And was it not the disgust and disappointment of the electors at the repeated failure of the Liberal Government to redeem these pledges, at their thrice-repeated breach of faith with regard to them, that gave the Tories their opportunity, and, far more than the only equally false pledges of the Conservatives, was responsible for the return of the present Government

to power, and placed the foreign and colonial policy of the country in the hands of Lord Salisbury, "the lath painted to look like iron"?

There is assuredly "a Nemesis that waits on broken faith"—whether that faith be broken by a Conservative or by a Liberal Government; and the Liberal Forwards would do well to fairly and squarely face the question whether the ultimate responsibility for the "pain, the shame, and the mischief of the last two years in Eastern policy" does not rest rather upon the Liberal Government of 1892-5, a Government which, while making a great show of very safe enthusiasm with regard to measures which they well knew the House of Lords was sure to block, very carefully avoided dealing with the reforms, great, beneficent, and far-reaching, which they might have introduced in their Budgets and carried into law in the teeth of the House of Lords. And the Liberal Forwards would do well also to seriously, most seriously, consider whether they, by their persistent silence with regard to the said reforms, are not themselves continuing, are not themselves persisting in that breach of faith.

In the second resolution the Liberal Forwards "affirmed their social creed."

Those inquisitive correspondents who, in the *New Age* in the summer of last year, tried to elicit from Mr. P. W. Clayden, the wary hon. sec. of the Liberal Forwards, whether or no they had any definite policy with regard to social and industrial questions, and if so, what that policy might be, now have their answer, and much good may it do them. They now know that the Liberal Forwards "believe that political reforms are chiefly valuable as means towards those great social reforms in which Labour is so vitally interested." Surely that ought to satisfy them. Surely not one of them can be so ultra-inquisitive as to ask, What are "those great social reforms in which Labour is so vitally interested"?

Such at all events seems to be the opinion of the *New Age*, which in its issue of February 10, rejoicing over the big meeting of the previous week, and perhaps still suffering from an attack of what the Yankees call "swell-head," says:

"The fact is, that there is no policy before the Liberal party but that represented by Mr. George Russell and his friends. The National Liberal Federation, *most wisely and justly*, concentrates its attention on registration reform. The Liberal leaders have let the whole party down by their miserable acquiescence in the feeble mockery of Parliamentary inquiry by the South African Committee and their ignominious failure to discuss the doings of the European Concert last session. It is not too much to say that they have entirely lost the confidence of the party. If they will not lead, whom do they expect the army to follow? It is because there is a *distinct lead* in the three resolutions of last Thursday's meeting that it has evoked so large a response." (*Italics mine.*)

It is, indeed, most wise and just—is it not?—that the National Liberal Federation, one of the foremost exponents of the science of

statesmanship—the science of “How not to do it,” as Dickens called it—should concentrate its attention on registration reform which the House of Lords could block and would block, while absolutely neglecting the great “bread and butter” Budget reforms which the House of Lords could not block if it would, and which the Liberal party therefore *could carry if it would*. And as for the “distinct lead” in the three resolutions passed on February 3, the *New Age* itself is at once forced to admit that the second resolution at all events stands in need of further elucidation, and devotes upwards of half a column to clearing it up.

“Power,” we are told, “must be put in reality, as now in pretence, into the hands of the people; but what are they to do with it when they get it? Pass the social reforms in which Labour is vitally interested, say the Liberal Forwards; and Mr. Mendl, in his able and interesting speech, replied to the further question as to what the reforms are. The most pressing of all is forced on public attention by the failure of the engineers’ strike for eight hours. In New Zealand there is a law which enables the Government to interfere in all cases of Industrial War, and though the New Zealand Act would not work here, it cannot be beyond the resources of Liberal statesmanship to adapt its principles to the different conditions of British industrial life. Nor can there be much difficulty in giving the principle of shorter hours sufficient elasticity to adapt itself to the needs of different trades or different localities. Temperance reform, increase of efficiency in elementary education, and some honourable provision for the old age of industrious workers, are all actually in the air. Land reform, better dwellings, the abolition of slums and overcrowding, and the taxation of ground rents and values, are actually—[who would have thought it?—]parts of the recognised Liberal programme. It may be left to the Parliamentary leaders—[‘It is not too much to say that they have entirely lost the confidence of the party’]—to decide the order in which these reforms shall be taken, but not one of them ought to be dropped by the Liberals.”

On January 27, dealing with this very question of the order in which reforms shall be taken, the *New Age* said:

“The National Liberal Federation has given voice to the universal feeling among Liberals that the first thing to be done is, in the words of the second resolution, ‘to secure the franchise to all capable citizens.’ But when the Registration Laws have put the House of Commons under full popular control, its supremacy over the House of Lords must be ensured. *Till this is done nothing can be done.* Liberal measures will be mutilated or rejected, and Liberal Ministries will be powerless [even to pass Registration Laws]. Does anybody believe that any single measure of social reform will ever be allowed to pass the House of Lords by the free consent of the Peers and the Bishops? There is not a monopoly which the Lords—spiritual and temporal—will consent to disestablish.” (Italics mine.)

This in spite of the fact that in the correspondence previously alluded to it was clearly pointed out that the House of Lords cannot block the Budget, and that in the Budget could be included such important political and social reforms as payment of members

and election expenses, the abolition of the breakfast-table duties, old-age pensions, and the taxation of land values, the last named of which would disestablish and disendow land monopoly—the chief, the parent monopoly, the monopoly in which their Landlordships are most vitally interested.

Viewing the actions and the pronouncements of the Liberal "leaders," the Liberal Forwards, and the Liberal Press as a whole, one is, however unwillingly, forced to the conclusion that they are quite aware of all this, but are so tender with regard to "vested interests," and so careless of the best interests of the community at large, that instead of at once heading a vigorous attack against the citadel of monopoly, and striking at the weakest spot in the enemy's defences, they deliberately endeavour to throw dust in the eyes of their followers, to divert their attention from the path that leads to certain victory, and to waste their energy in a sham fight against the House of Lords.

Either this is so, or they are the densest and most fatuous of politicians and journalists, for their attention has over and over again been called to the matter, and the slightest, the most cursory study of the question, would show them what should be done.

On March 21, 1894, Lord Rosebery, speaking at St. James's Hall in reply to an address from the London County Council, said that the taxation of ground values was a principle that had become "universally established," and referring to the rapidity with which converts were made, he added: "Well, I say while you make converts like that you need not be very much afraid if for a session, or two sessions, this principle does not have immediate effect; but you may be certain of this, that as long as her Majesty's present advisers are in power, you will meet with their unflinching support in any honest and honourable proposal that you have to make, either with regard to betterment or the taxation of ground rents."

No man who understood all that the taxation of land values and the other reforms which it renders possible mean to the workers of this country could have so lightly contemplated its indefinite postponement.

The principle so "universally established" did not have effect in the ensuing "Liberal" Budget nor in that of 1895, though just prior to the introduction of his last Budget, Sir William Harcourt was inundated with postcards showing what reforms that Budget might carry out; though on March 8, 1895, even the Tories dare not challenge a division on Mr. Provand's motion for the taxation of the unearned increment, and the following resolution was recorded as the unanimous decision of the House of Commons: "That no system of taxation can be equitable unless it includes the direct assessment of the enhanced value of land due to the increase of population and wealth and the growth of towns."

The postcards referred to were worded as follows :

“THE BUDGET AS IT MIGHT BE.

“In the Newcastle programme the Government stands pledged to the hilt to the following reforms, all of which should find a place in this year's Budget : Payment of Members, Payment of Election Expenses, Abolition of the Breakfast-table Duties, and the Taxation of Land Values. Were Sir Wm. Harcourt to levy on present values the tax of 4s. in the £.—which, being now levied on the values of 1692, instead of on those of 1895, brings in a paltry £1,050,000 only !—he would net a revenue of £32,000,000 to £40,000,000, the rental value of the land of the United Kingdom being estimated at from £160,000,000 to £200,000,000. He could then readily redeem all the pledges above mentioned, and introduce besides a generous and comprehensive scheme of old-age pensions ; and the balance, if any, could be applied to the reduction of the more oppressive of the present rates and taxes. The land value tax, moreover, being levied upon the full annual value of all land, whether put to use or not, would force into the market the 18,000,000 acres of land now held out of use, and the labourers would, therefore, be able to obtain land for allotments on reasonable terms. The result would be that a minimum wage of 26s. or 30s. per week would soon be the rule throughout the country, for on Lord Carrington's estates the labourers, obtaining the land at the same rent as the farmers, can clear that amount per week. ‘Surplus labour’ would thus be attracted from the towns to the country, and the unemployed problem would be largely solved.

“If in favour of a Budget such as the above, sign your name below, affix a halfpenny stamp, and send this card to the Rt. Hon. Sir W. V. Harcourt, the Treasury, Westminster.

“Signature : : : : :
“Address : : : : :.”

This card was widely circulated, and a large number were signed and sent on to Sir William Harcourt as suggested.

His only reply was a sneer at “amateur financiers” and a humdrum Budget.

My attention may, perhaps, be directed to the “Radical,” the “magnificent,” the “epoch-making” Budget of 1894. This Budget was supposed to level up the taxation on realty so as to place realty as regards the death duties on the same footing as personal property. And how was it done? Here is what Sir William Harcourt said about his own scheme :

“Under the plan of the Government the increase of the death duties on personality will be £2,130,000, and upon realty £1,320,000. *But on the total of £1,320,000 put upon realty we have given compensation under Schedule (A) of the Income Tax amounting to £600,000 applicable to realty.* That will leave the net additional charge upon realty £700,000, of which sum £350,000 or £400,000 is asked from the landed interests of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland as their contribution to the defence of the country, and to *place their taxation upon an equality with that of other classes and interests.*” (Italics mine.)

The thing is simply farcical according to Sir William Harcourt's

own showing. Could there be a better—or a worse—example of "How not to do it"?

As a matter of fact, the "Landlord party" in their Agricultural Rating Act—or "Landlord Relief Act"—only went one better than Sir William Harcourt in his Budget of 1894. He laid down the principle of compensation. They gave it a wider and a more generous application.

Some such step was even foreshadowed by Sir William himself during the Budget debate of 1895. Replying to Mr. Jeffreys, who had complained that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had "said nothing to express sympathy and proposed no remedy for depression in the landed interest," and asked why he "did not give away the land tax," Sir William said (see *Times* report, May 3): "It is not from any want of sympathy I said nothing; it is from a want of means. I take great interest in the depression of the landed interest; but what can I say? If I had any money to give away, they would be among the first persons who would be deserving of the sympathy of this House; but I have no money to give away."

Sir William Harcourt could not "give away the land tax," but he could and did "give himself away"; and when the Conservatives came into power the "Landlord party" naturally considered that they were "among the first persons deserving of the sympathy of the House," and having money to give away relieved "the landed interest" to the tune of £2,000,000 per annum for five years.

Such is the record of the late Liberal Government, and the backward Liberal Forwards and the Liberal Press by maintaining silence on this question tacitly acquiesce in and practically persist in this breach of faith.

On all sides we are continually told by Liberal "leaders," Liberal Members of Parliament, and Liberal papers that, as Mr. Asquith told the Eighty Club the other evening, "the great problem which must be solved by the Liberal party, before they can hope to carry to a successful conclusion any of the important reforms which they desire to realise, is that of the limitation of the powers of the House of Lords."

To use an expressive Americanism, the Liberal "leaders" and the Liberal Press are simply endeavouring to "side-track" the democracy, and to get them to expend their energies in tilting at wind-mills.

Nothing could show this more clearly than the fate of a short letter that I sent to the *Westminster Gazette* in November last. Referring to the "mania for programme-spinning," the editor had said, "thoroughly to sift the old programmes rather than to start new ones is the best advice that can be given to the Liberal party during these years of Opposition." I wrote agreeing with this view, and said that it seemed to me that the first step in the sifting process

should be to distinguish what the party could do if it would from the things that it could do only if the House of Lords would. I then pointed out that the only measure that the House of Lords could not block was the Budget, and urged that if the Liberal leaders wished to establish their *bona fides* they should place in the forefront of their programme and pledge themselves to introduce at the very first opportunity a Budget redeeming all the pledges above enumerated. The letter was returned "with thanks," and it met with a similar fate when I sent it with an introductory note to the *Daily Chronicle*.

I have reason to know that this "conspiracy of silence" is only too general throughout the so-called Liberal Press.

Mr. John Morley and Sir William Harcourt, it is true, have in recent speeches referred favourably to the rating and taxation of land values; but, in view of the record of the late Liberal Cabinet on this question, the Liberal "leaders," if they desire the democracy again to place any faith in them, must give a clear and definite pledge that they will include in their very first Budget the taxation of land values and the other Budget reforms mentioned in the Newcastle Programme. This is rendered the more necessary by the extraordinary pronouncement with regard to the Newcastle Programme contained in the twentieth annual report of the National Liberal Federation submitted at their meeting at Leicester on March 22 and 23. Dealing with the subject of "Programme-making and Liberal Organisation," the report says:

"From the first day of its existence to the present time the Federation has steadily refused to formulate a political programme. Liberalism, when rightly understood, is too vast and too progressive to admit of the hard-and-fast formalism of a specific creed. How then did the Newcastle Programme come into existence? No Newcastle Programme was ever framed by the Federation or by any one connected with it; no programme whatever was presented at the annual council meeting at Newcastle or elsewhere, or at any other meeting of the Federation, whether council, conference, or committee. The council of the Federation meets once a year in some provincial centre to receive the annual report of the executive committee and appoint a president and treasurer. It is customary at these gatherings to pass certain resolutions which are believed to express the wishes of the vast majority of the Liberal party upon the leading questions of the day. These resolutions are prepared by the executive committee after consultation with all the federated associations, and after taking into full consideration any resolutions which may have been passed by the general committee of the Federation, or at local conferences held under its auspices. These resolutions are intended to inform the party leaders of the subjects in dealing with which they may rely upon the support of the party as a whole. The Federation does not interfere with the time or order in which questions should be taken up. That is the province of the leaders of the party. There can be discussion at the annual council meeting, but the resolutions must be accepted or rejected, not amended. They are the expression of a united desire. The executive committee may have misinterpreted the fact of such a desire, but a meeting of many hundreds of representatives without the full facts before it could not by

any process of impromptu amendment make a resolution more in harmony with the general wish of the federated associations unless by a happy but improbable accident. A considerable number of subjects were brought forward at the Newcastle meeting, but no new subject was introduced. All the reforms which were embodied in resolutions had been demanded at previous meetings. Some had been advocated by Liberals for many years. Several of the reforms demanded have since been achieved. But the resolutions of this particular meeting received a special significance from the fact that, without reference to any person connected with the Federation and to the surprise of every one, our great leader, Mr. Gladstone, instead of, as was anticipated, devoting his speech at the great public meeting to the subject of Ireland, took up *seriatim* the resolutions which had been passed at the council meetings and gave them the weight of his direct approval. The newspapers at once spoke of the 'Newcastle Programme.' For a time the members of the executive committee protested, but the name stuck and entered into common use, and it has had perhaps a certain convenience as expressing a certain number of reforms which were advocated at Newcastle, and which will all be carried in time."

It is difficult to conceive what object the National Liberal Federation imagine can be served by such a statement as the above. Whether we speak of the "Newcastle Programme," "the Liberal platform," or "certain resolutions which are believed to express the wishes of the vast majority of the Liberal party upon the leading questions of the day," it is all one; unless, indeed, we are to understand that these resolutions are merely "pious opinions," embodying principles that may some day be carried into effect, but which have only the remotest bearing upon practical politics, and must not be considered as pledges binding the party to any definite course of action. In that case the resolutions would not be worth the paper they are written on, and the sooner a body of men who waste their time in this manner give up pretending to officer the Liberal party and direct its counsels, the better it will be for the party.

Either the National Liberal Federation is a colossal sham, whose real object is to mislead, not, to lead, the democracy, or it must be utterly devoid of political acumen. While the House of Lords bars the path for all Liberal measures, with the sole exception of the Budget, it should be obvious to the merest political tyro that the proper course is to direct attention to those reforms which can be included in the Budget, and can be carried in spite of the House of Lords. The National Liberal Federation, however, prefers to utterly ignore the Budget pledges of the Liberal party, and calls meetings at Derby and at Leicester to take part in what, under the circumstances, are mere academic discussions on electoral reform and suchlike, and to pass resolutions on that and other matters—resolutions which, so far as they deal with politics, would seem to be of practically no value whatever.

Fine phrases about "Liberalism, when properly understood," being "too vast and too progressive to admit of the hard-and-fast formalism of a specific creed," are only so much bunkum. The electors have

a right to know clearly and definitely what steps the Liberal party propose to take, what reforms the Liberal leaders, if returned to power, intend to introduce; and when, on the one side, we have the fact that the House of Lords cannot block the Budget, and, on the other, the fact that they can, and in all probability will, block all other Bills, the electors have a right to demand, and the more intelligent of them do demand, that the Liberal leaders shall put in the forefront of their programme, and pledge themselves hard and fast to introduce at the very first opportunity, a good, sound, democratic Budget, embodying the reforms to which the party, in spite of 'all explanations that do not explain, stands pledged to the hilt. ⁴

If there is not sufficient grit and common sense in the rank and file of the Liberal party to rid that party of leaders who do not lead, and to draft a real live Liberal programme, and put into Parliament a body of men who will see to it that that programme is carried into effect in a thoroughly businesslike and honest fashion, then the grand old Liberal party must go to the wall.

Happily, the rank and file are by no means so dense and so gullible as the party wire-pullers seem to imagine, and the more Radical section are already making a move in the direction indicated, as witness the programme recently adopted by the Metropolitan Radical Federation.

The programme is embodied in a manifesto of some ten octavo pages. The opening paragraphs, dealing with "the Liberal Defeat," "Unredeemed Pledges," and "the Lords and the Budget," are so outspoken and to the point that I give them, with the programme, in full:

"THE RADICAL PROGRAMME."

"THE LIBERAL DEFEAT.

"The Liberal party was defeated in 1895 because the confidence of the people in the Liberal leaders had been shaken. Even the almost unprecedented combination of monopolies and vested interests—most of which had been threatened and irritated, but not effectively dealt with, by the Government of 1892—would have been powerless to return Lord Salisbury to power, if the mass of the workers had believed the Liberal leaders to be earnestly desirous of carrying out the Radical reforms to which they were pledged. By the 'Newcastle Programme' the Government stood committed to many reforms which contained the promise of far-reaching and beneficent results. How did the Government fulfil the promises on which it was returned to office in 1892?

"UNREDEEMED PLEDGES.

"Take, for instance, the Taxation of Ground Values and the Free Breakfast Table. Both of these are financial measures. The first is the

¹ The heads of this programme were discussed and adopted by the Council of the Federation on February 20, 1897; the manifesto was adopted at the Council Meeting on October 16, 1897.

necessary means for bringing about the second. Both were promised in the 'Newcastle Programme.' The Taxation of Land Values had been for years persistently demanded by the London County Council, and by a host of municipal and rating authorities all over the kingdom. Trades Councils, Trades Unions, Ratepayers' Associations, Working Men's Clubs, and other bodies representing those who bear the burden of the rates, had demanded it. Mr. Gladstone had advocated it. Resolutions in favour of it had been more than once carried in the House of Commons. When Mr. Provand proposed it—just before Sir Wm. Harcourt's third Budget—on March 8th, 1895, even the Tories dare not challenge a division, and it was *unanimously* resolved by the House of Commons:

"That no system of taxation can be equitable unless it includes the direct assessment of the enhanced value of land due to the increase of population and wealth and the growth of towns."

"The proper place for such a reform is in the Budget. Whatever measures a Government may neglect, it is impossible to omit the Annual Budget; and every Budget gives a golden opportunity for financial reform. The Ministry of 1892 brought in three Budgets, in any one of which the Taxation of Land Values—the most widely demanded item in their programme—might have been included, had the Government been honestly determined upon carrying out its pledges. From every constituency thousands of memorials poured in upon Sir William Harcourt, asking him to keep his pledges; the fact that he did not do so was remembered against him everywhere by disappointed Radicals when the General Election of 1895 came.

"THE LORDS AND THE BUDGET.

"The excuse usually made by apologists of Front Bench inactivity is that 'the House of Lords blocks the way.' As regards financial measures this is demonstrably false. In 1678 the House of Commons passed the following Resolution:

"That all aids and supplies, and aids to his Majesty in Parliament, are the sole gift of the Commons; and all Bills for the granting of any such aids and supplies ought to begin with the Commons; and that it is the undoubted and sole right of the Commons to direct, limit, and appoint in such Bills the ends, purposes, considerations, conditions, limitations, and qualifications of such grants; *which ought not to be changed or altered by the House of Lords.*"—*House of Commons Journals*, vol. ix. p. 509.

"It is upon this resolution," says the greatest authority upon Parliamentary law (Sir Erskine May, *Law of Parliament*, ninth edition, p. 642), 'that all proceedings between the two Houses, on matters of supply, are now founded. The principle is acquiesced in by the House of Lords.' The Tory Lord Chancellor (Halsbury) has quite recently admitted (April 2nd, 1897) that it has been the law of Parliament for over two centuries, although Lord Salisbury, in 1891, had characterised the 'claim of the House of Commons' as 'excessive.'

"The fact is, that the House of Lords can neither initiate *nor alter* a Money-Bill. If they have any power at all in the matter, it is only that of total rejection. But this is a power which they have seldom ventured to exercise, and which is, moreover, bitterly resented by the House of Commons.

"When the Lords rejected the Paper Duties Bill in 1860, thus destroying

the balance of the Budget for the year, the Commons declared that the power of the Lords to reject Bills relating to taxation was :

“ ‘justly regarded by this House with peculiar jealousy, as affecting the right of the Commons to grant the supplies, and to provide ways and means for the service of the year. That to guard for the future against an undue exercise of that power by the Lords, and to secure to the Commons their rightful control over taxation and supply, *this House has in its own hands the power so to impose and remit taxes, and to frame bills of supply, that the right of the Commons as to the matter, manner, measure, and time may be maintained inviolate.*’ --House of Commons Journals, vol. cxv. p. 360.

“ Every ‘Queen’s Speech,’ every Finance Bill, bears witness in so many words to the fact that it is the business of the Commons’ House to impose, vary, or remit taxation. The Lords cannot, and dare not, *alter* a Budget. They dare not *reject* a Budget, for that would mean bringing the whole business of the country to a standstill.

“ The unfailing test, therefore, of the sincerity of a Liberal Government, is its readiness to embody urgent financial reforms in its Budgets. It is useless to take a stand on measures which the Lords are likely to mutilate or reject, and then to complain that nothing can be accomplished because of the Upper House. A truly Radical Cabinet will begin with the urgent financial reforms which, embodied in the Budget, the Lords cannot mutilate, and dare not reject.

“THE RADICAL PROGRAMME.

“ This, then, is the keynote of the Radical Programme which the Metropolitan Radical Federation herewith submits to the sympathetic consideration of Radicals everywhere, and for which it demands the attention of the Liberal leaders. Its items are :

“ (a) *For the First Radical Budget* -

- “ 1. Payment of Members and of Election Expenses.
- “ 2. Abolition of the Breakfast Table Duties.
- “ 3. Old Age Pensions.
- “ 4. Taxation of Land Values.

“ (b) *As soon after as may be*—

- “ 5. Home Rule All Round.
- “ 6. Universal Suffrage.
- “ 7. Registration Reform.
- “ 8. Second Ballot.

“ (c) *If the Lords reject or mutilate these (5 & 8)*—

- “ 9. Abolition of the House of Lords.

“ This Programme differs from the ‘Newcastle Programme’ mainly in the inclusion of Old Age Pensions, of Home Rule for England, Wales, and Scotland (as well as for Ireland), and of the Second Ballot. It is

simpler, more practical, and more consistent; more easy of realisation and less easy to evade; and, for this very reason, it will be less acceptable than a long list of 'pious opinions' to the Whig Lords who, in the past, have filled Liberal Cabinets and robbed Radicals of the results of electoral victory."

There follows a brief but masterly exposition of the four Budget reforms, and of the other measures included in the programme. Copies of the manifesto were forwarded to the Liberal "leaders" and to the principal Liberal papers. Evidently one did not reach the editor of the *New Age*, for in face of this manifesto he could scarcely claim that "there is no policy before the party but that represented by Mr. George Russell and his friends"—the policy, that is to say, stated so clearly and in such detail in the second resolution passed at the Liberal Forward meeting!

The Metropolitan Radical Federation have placed before the Liberal party a real live programme. They have placed before the electors of this country something worth fighting for. It is a programme so clear, so logical, and so practical that it is bound to make headway, and if those in the Liberal party who believe in honesty in politics, who believe in the political, social, and industrial freedom at which this programme aims, who realise the intense and undeserved suffering that the continuance of the present unjust system entails daily and hourly upon hundreds of thousands of their fellow-countrymen, will only make during the next three or four years a resolute fight on such lines, and endeavour to bring home to every worker throughout this country what the carrying of such a Budget would mean in the way of lightened taxation on the necessities of life, greater security for old age, the opening up of numberless avenues for the employment of labour, and vastly greater political power, by means of which to secure complete political, social, and industrial freedom, the next general election would see such a decisive democratic victory as would quickly, peacefully, and most beneficially revolutionise the conditions of modern life and work, and make England really and truly "Merrie England." The Liberal party might have to be re-cast in the process; there would certainly have to be a drastic purging away of the present official Whig element; possibly the work can only be done by a Federated Workers' party, such as I suggested in the WESTMINSTER REVIEW of December last; but be that as it may, the work ought to be done, and sooner or later the work will be done.

But, ah! the difference between that sooner and that later. To many a man or woman it may mean the difference between life and death; to many a man the difference between a life of honest industry and a life of crime; to many a woman the difference between a pure and virtuous life and being forced by poverty upon the streets.

"Come with me," said Richard Cobden, as John Bright turned heart-stricken from a new-made grave. "There are in England women and children dying of hunger—with hunger made by the laws. Come with me, and we will not rest till we repeal those laws." That was the spirit that animated the fight that resulted in the repeal of the Corn Laws, and it is in that spirit that we must band together for the great fight that lies before us.

ARTHUR WITHY.

READING AT SIGHT FOR ILLITERATES.

APPARENTLY an unattainable ideal! As well expect speech without breath or sight without eyes! And yet I hope to prove to the reader the possibility of its realisation. "Twere a consummation devoutly to be wished," for it would not only enable children to give years to the study of technical subjects and remove a slur upon our civilisation, but it would go far to make English the language of international communication. As regards this last, Mr. Gladstone, himself an accomplished linguist, said years ago, "I honestly can say I cannot conceive how it is that a foreigner learns to pronounce English, when you recollect the total absence of rule, method, system, and all the auxiliaries which people get when they have to acquire something that is difficult of attainment." He goes on to say that had he been born a foreigner he thinks it would have driven him mad to learn English.

To lessen the difficulty in learning to read, some reformers have proposed to re-model the spelling of the language, but with so little success that, after more than fifty years of strenuous effort, the Civil Service Commissioners still refuse to pass the omission of the "u" in honour! Perhaps the remedy is worse than the disease. The most scientific of the new spelling schemes is phonetypy, but it has the fatal objection that it involves a complete change of type. The "fonetik" system, by altering the spelling, vitiates the future orthography of the scholar, and further, by its system of indicating many single sounds with two letters, introduces fresh silent characters. The last objection applies to Robinson's method, which, moreover, deals with only 75 per cent. of English words. Reading at sight is possible with none of these except the first, which is out of court.

In a recent number¹ of the WESTMINSTER REVIEW I advocated the adoption for international purposes of a form of English in which the silent letters were omitted and a long vowel was indicated by a long mark. The result was an easily legible form of the language with, relatively, very few spelling anomalies. In fact the remaining difficulties were so few that I set to work to classify them

¹ September 1897.

and to form an alphabet in which each character should have but one sound. But, warned by the failures of my predecessors, I determined to alter neither type nor spelling. The question was thus narrowed down to one of diacritics. Those, however, in ordinary use, such as diaereses and curves, are very hard to remember, and their names, when they have any, are often unsuitable for teaching purposes. I have therefore applied *algebraic notation* to the representation of the different sounds of a given letter. The figure diacritics have answered admirably and have enabled me to construct, for teaching purposes, an alphabet which, saving fine phonetic distinctions, gives a special symbol for every sound in the language; the standard being not exact orthoëpy, but clear intelligibility. The alphabet thus formed will be found at length in the pamphlet entitled *The Reformed Alphabet* (Pitman: London and New York). A few examples will give an idea of its structure. The letter "a" has six sounds. In the conventional alphabet the child never knows for certain which of these sounds is meant when he sees this letter. With the Reformed Alphabet he can see at a glance; for the "a" of "pale," is marked "a¹"; of "at," "a²"; of "calm," "a³"; of "all," "a⁴"; of "was," "a⁵"; and of "any," "a⁶." Again, the letter "c" has three sounds: that of the "c" in "ocean" is marked "c¹"; of "clock," "c²"; and of "city," "c³." The figure (') it may be remarked, represents the sound of the letter as given in the ordinary alphabet. Diphthongs and digraphs are placed in brackets, partly to prevent a child pronouncing each letter separately, and partly to make the figure qualify the combination, instead of one of the two component letters. Thus the surd as in "thin" is marked '(th)'; the sonant, as in "this" (th): but a large number of such combined letters cease to be necessary.

It was obviously inadmissible to omit the silent letters. For these, therefore, which occur in something like 30 per cent. of the words of the floating language, an easily intelligible sign was adopted—namely, "°" (nought).

Given a standard sound, the system here described may be extended to every word in the language, since figures are capable of indefinite extension. But in some cases the instances of an anomalous sound of a given letter were so few as to make it inadvisable to add a special symbol to the alphabet. A familiar instance is the "v" sound of "f" in "of," which is solitary. These exceptions are marked "°"—"of °." Excluding obsolete words and some of those foreign words which retain their original pronunciation, the exceptions number about a dozen.

In the Reformed Alphabet the entire number of symbols is seventy-two, and each symbol stands always for the same sound. The orthodox alphabet has, including diphthongs and digraphs, forty-five symbols all of more or less uncertain sound, for the exceptions number nearer

21,000 than twelve. Dr. Martin, in *The Gordian Knot Cut*, gives an amusing example of a sentence, the words of which are spelt in strict analogy with others of the same sound: "Igh bat ai nyon kought phrachm mhy taighlar tu deig." It would puzzle anybody to read this as "I bought a new coat from my tailor to-day"; but I do not suppose that a child learning to read would express any surprise. His previous experiences of the curiosities of the language would prepare him for anything! Yet figure diacritics will make every one of these grotesquely spelt words phonetic.

There is thus available for teaching purposes an alphabet which, though containing only twenty-seven more characters than that now in use, indicates phonetically every word in the English language. And this, too, without change either of type or spelling.

The difference of labour in teaching a child to read in the two systems is enormous. To take the long "e" sound. In the Reformed Alphabet this is indicated by *two certain* sounds—"e'" and "i'"—*e.g.*, me, marine; while the system at present in use involves learning at least *twenty-two uncertain* letters or combinations. The algebraic system leads up naturally to reading in ordinary type, for the child will dispense as soon as possible with reference to the figures, if only from the aversion to unnecessary effort inherent in the human race. Further, it involves no difficulty in teaching; for it is perfectly easy to teach a child to spell the syllables "ba," "ba'," and "ab," "a'b." For the oral spelling of *words* it is better for the pupil not to repeat the figures.

Spelling, as taught at present, is one of the most difficult of arts, and as regards all but the simplest sounds is unsuited to the capacity of an average child of tender years. It is practically learnt, not by special lessons, but by reading and writing. These furnish the learner with a visual recollection of the appearance of each word and of the relative position of its component letters. We laugh at the Chinese, who are said to have a separate symbol for each of their 30,000 words; but some thousands of our own words are practically symbols, for they are recognised by their appearance as a whole, and not by their letter formation.

The more phonetic a language is, the easier it is to learn to read. Thus, Italian children are often taught to read in three months. But the system here advocated renders English more phonetic even than Italian, and presents such obvious advantages that I was impelled to devote my scanty leisure to the production of a Reading Primer, in which the exact value of each letter is represented.

In the midst of this work, however, the idea suggested itself that it might be possible for a pupil, who had thoroughly learnt this alphabet, to *read at sight* with no previous instruction in spelling—indeed other systems attempt this with selected words. Such a scheme with the orthodox alphabet would only suggest itself to the

brain of a lunatic, but it comes within measurable distance of realisation when that alphabet is so modified that *each character represents a single unalterable sound, and when the sound of every word is the sum of that of its component letters.* But it is possible even with some of our present letters. A child who has been taught, for instance, "s" and "o," will know without being told that they spell "so."

In fact the only obstacle to reading at sight with a phonetic alphabet is a very small one. It lies in the names of the letters. For example, the letter "b" is not simply "b" but as sounded is "bē." Similarly "k" is not one letter but two—"kā," while "f" is "ēf." It is clear therefore, that in order to pronounce a word by successively sounding its letters, the *names* of the letters must be ignored and each symbol must be known and expressed by its *sound* or "*power*" only, as taught in Kindergarten schools. Thus "b" must be thought of, not as "bē," but as "be"—*i.e.*, only the explosive sound of the consonant, without any vowel adjunct. In the same way, "s" must have the hissing sound only, without the prefixed "ē"; and (sh), the sound used in demanding silence. The only other point that it is necessary for the teacher to observe is that there must be no pause between the letters—the sound of one must glide insensibly into that of its successor, as a person hums at sight a *legato* passage in music.

Remembering these rules, let the reader put himself in the mental attitude of a pupil unable to read, and endeavour to form the following words by pronouncing in succession, slowly and without pauses, the sounds of their component letters, omitting mutes (marked °): (sh)in°, dēbāte°, fōre°īg°n, rēcē°ip°t ēlēmentārŷ.

He can then hardly fail to be convinced that any child or adult, however illiterate and whether his mother tongue be English or not, will be able to read at sight when once he has thoroughly mastered his symbols. And every word in the language is as simple as the above examples, when written in algebraic notation. At first, of course, the words will come out slowly; but, with a little practice, the difficulty will diminish and, after a time, as always happens in similar cases, the process will become automatic and the reading fluent. Later still, by fewer and fewer references to the figures, the pupil will become a reader of ordinary print. There is nothing new under the sun, and it is not unlikely that this system of reading without spelling may be a mere reversion to that of the inventor of the first real alphabet. For, with a simple language consisting of few sounds and having a symbol to express each of those sounds, the necessity for spelling would hardly suggest itself. Spelling, if this view be correct, was a distinct and much later invention rendered necessary when, by the gradual divergence of sounds from their symbols and the

introduction of new sounds, the alphabet had ceased to be entirely phonetic.

Now how long will a person take to read a simple lesson in the special print? As the Reading Book will not be available for another month, it is impossible to speak from actual experience. But, taking the case of a child who knows already the common alphabet, it may be estimated thus: Deducting these twenty-six, we have forty-six symbols. Allowing three-quarters of an hour as the limit of the power of sustained attention, there should be no difficulty in teaching six sounds at each lesson, provided every third lesson were devoted to recapitulation. With two lessons a day, this would occupy six days, while a second week would suffice to familiarise the pupil with the method of running the sounds together. Words of more than one syllable will be divided in the Primer by a new device, the stress hyphen; this is shaped like an arrow-head and points to the stressed syllable. With this additional aid it is probably well within the mark to say that a child, after one month's instruction, will read (in the special print) as well as one who has been taught for eighteen months under the old system. Spelling, too, will be learned far more easily after the art of reading has been acquired than before. But there can be little doubt that a very bright child, or an educated adult foreigner who is able to articulate all English sounds, will be able to read in a marvellously short time.

There is still unfortunately a very considerable number of adults unable to read. Even so recently as the autumn of 1897 Dr. Muir, who is one of the inspectors of education for Scotland, said in his report, "I fear that far too many children leave school unable to read," and this after eight years' teaching! Some illiterate adults are too old to have profited by the Compulsory Education Act. Some, again, lived as children in districts too remote from the schoolmaster, and others once learnt to read a little and have since lapsed into illiteracy. The education of these unfortunates presents for philanthropic effort a hitherto neglected field which, in the absence of a special league, might be cultivated by missionary societies and, with the aid of the Bible Society or the S.P.C.K., by district visitors. For in consequence of the slight amount of supervision necessary, but little demand would be made upon the time of the latter.

It would be tedious to enlarge upon the great secondary benefits which would result from the adoption of the system here advocated; but it may be pointed out that the solidarity of the United States and of the British Empire would be promoted. The United States includes in its population several millions unable to speak the language of the country; while the dependent races of the British Empire number some hundreds of millions in the same predicament. The sooner these aliens learn the national language, the sooner will they

become good, useful and patriotic citizens. The benefits are not confined to English, however, for the principle is applicable to every language with an alphabet base.¹

The usefulness of an idea is not to be measured by the amount of inventive genius displayed by it. In the present case the latter element is very small, but in beneficent results it is likely to be exceeded only by the very highest achievements of the past. It is hoped that the fate of the system will not be decided by the usual reference to the *purely* practical man, for, having no original ideas himself, he is incapable of judging those of others, and his aspirations do not extend beyond the rule of thumb. Such men do good work, but their place is among the ushers of the court and not on the bench. It can scarcely be denied that a *prima facie* case has been made out. Let the system therefore be tried experimentally on an adequate scale, and the result referred to a committee of her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools, or of schoolmasters of wide views.

In conclusion, I commend the system to all who desire to see their country compete on an equal footing with other nations; to parents and all who feel for children in their arid early studies; to philanthropists who grieve to see so many adults unable to read; and, lastly, to all who exercise control over education.

R. W. LEFTWICH.

¹ I have also, as far as my limited linguistic attainments permit, compiled a Comparative Alphabet. In order to be read at sight by this method, I find French requires 41 symbols, German 51, and Italian 35. See *The International Alphabet* (Pitman).

THE HISTORY OF THE FORMS AND MIGRATIONS OF THE SIGNS OF THE CROSS AND THE SU-ASTIKA.

PART II.—THE ALLIGATOR OR DRAGON CONSTELLATION, MAKER OF THE SEASONS.

THE alligator-god, the uniter Vyāsa, the son of the goddess Shar, became in Indian mythology the three Ribhus of the *Rigveda*. They are called the sons of Su-dhanvan, the god of the bow (dhanvan) of the Su, that is, of the heavenly bird, the primæval cloud and storm-bird. This was the bird which brought Soma from heaven, and whose blood fell to earth in the life-giving rain when, hit by the arrow of the rainbow god Krishānu, the drawer (karsh) of the bow, who was a counterpart of Su-dhanvan. He is thus a form both of the cloud-father Parā-shara and of the black cloud-bull Pūshan wedded to the sun-maiden, the female form of the Egyptian sun-god Horus, who appears in Indian history as Satyavati, while Horus, the hawk-headed god of Egypt, is in Indra her brother Matsya, the fish, they being the young sun-god and the sun-mother born of the sun-hawks Hat-hor and Adrikā. The alligator, son of the fish sun-mother, the Maga-Sebek of Egypt, is the son of the ritualistic age recorded in the *Brāhmanas* as that in which the Palāsha-tree was sanctified as the first tree containing the divine juice of the heavenly Soma, a name derived from the root Su. This tree (*Butea frondosa*) is the evergreen totem-tree of the Mundas or mountaineers, and it was its first leaf which fell to earth as the feather of the Su-bird called Su-parna, or the bird of the feathers (parna) of Su, when it was wounded by Krishānu's arrow. It is a tree which grows as a creeper in the forests of Central India and blossoms just before the rains of the summer solstice, when it covers the woods with sheets of brilliant scarlet blossoms. It was these flowers appearing as the announcers of the coming rains which have made the tree sacred first to the Munda hillmen, who entered India from the north-east long before the millet and corn growing immigrants from Asia Minor, and, secondly, to the later sons of the Kusha-grass, who

worshipped the new and full moon. It is on their altar of earth, built in the form of a woman to receive the new and full moon sacrifices, that the sacred fire is encircled with a triangle of Palāsha sticks, typifying the three seasons of the year of the Western mother-bird who brings the rains, who is called besides Su-parna, the Shyena or frost- (shya) bird of winter. It is as her special stick that the western twig is first lighted by the kindling-stick as that uniting those of the north and south which form the apex of the triangle.¹

The red blossoms of this tree celebrate the victory of the sun-god of the summer solstice over his northern winter foes of frost and darkness.

That the three Ribhus who in the *Rigveda* make the cups denoting the seasons are the sons of the alligator-god, is proved by the coincidence of the name Ribhu with that of the Babylonian Ribus,² called in Akkadian "the great divine princes," the lords of time, and with the Hebrew Rahab, meaning the alligator. That the latter was, like the Ribhus, a lord of time and the god of a sacred constellation, is proved by the worship at Carthage of Rahab as the constellation Draco. As I have shown in my analysis of the history of the taking of Jericho, the moon-city of the New and Full moon worshippers, it was this constellation, called that of Rahab the courtesan, who greatly helped Joshua, or Hosh-ia the sun-god, in its capture.³ Hosh-ia or Hush-ia, meaning the Jehovah of the Hus,⁴ was the creating god of the sons, called Husham and Shuham, of the mother-bird Hu or Khu, and of the Pole-star father god Dan, the judge, the Akkadian Danu, who is said in the *Zendavesta* to be the father of the Turanians called Dānus.⁵ This god Hosh-ia was, like the Indian Vyāsa, the god of a union of two opposing sections of the nation, for he was the leader of the tribe of Ephraim, that is, of the two ashes (eper), the Northern and Southern races.

He is said in the Bible to be the son of Nun, meaning the fish in Hebrew, and this marks another coincidence between him and the son of the Hindu fish-mother Satyavati. Nun is called in his Akkadian ideogram "the Lord of the divine enclosure of the one God," i.e., the Pole-star god; and on the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, chap. xvii., he is spoken of as "the primæval water, Nun, the Supreme God, the Self-existent."⁶ He is thus the creating god, whose life-giving breath raised the sacred mist which moved on the

¹ Eggeeling's *Sat. Bārḥ*. I. 3, 20; I. 3, 4, 1-5. *S. B. E.* vol. xii. pp. 90, 91. Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. pp. 164-166.

² Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures* for 1887. Lect. iii. p. 141, note 1.

³ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay v. pp. 492-499.

⁴ *Ibid.* vol. i. essay iii. p. 303, note 2.

⁵ Darmesteter's *Zendavesta Aban Yasht*, xviii. 73. *S. B. E.* vol. xxiii. p. 71. Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. ii. essay viii. p. 151.

⁶ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. p. 292. H. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der alten Ägypter*, pp. 21-25, 106.

face of the waters in Genesis before man was created. It was the life-giving breath of this mist-father of life, which is in the great cosmogonic hymn of the *Rigveda*, I. 164, 8-11, said to have entered as the engendering father spirit into the womb of the mother of the year calf, the sun-god of the sun-year of 360 days. The spirit-god Nun is also in Egyptian theology the Lord of the creating eight, the four male and four female spirit-gods which succeeded the earlier eight creating apes as the symbols of the god of the eight-rayed star. These eight gods, headed by Nun, are depicted in the Egyptian temples as the four male frogs who are partners of the four female snake-mothers.¹ He is thus, as god of the creating eight connected with the worship of the circling sun, deified as Krishna the black antelope, the eighth son of Vāsu-deva, who in the war against the Kaurāvyas was the charioteer of Arjuna, who marched under the banner of the ape.

The guardian constellation Rahab, which was the ally and assistant of the uniting sun-god son of Nun, is shown by its name to be connected with the worship of the sun-god Ra of the Hindus and Egyptians. It was originally the constellation of the Dragon or Alligator, which we call Draco, and it watched over the inauguration of the year of the sun-god of the united Northern and Southern races, the year when the sun-god led by the Shyena or frost- (shya) bird began to turn northwards at the winter solstice. This year, beginning in spring, was that of the Vedic Ribhus. They are called the makers of the cups denoting the seasons in the Brahmanic ritual of the year of three seasons called the Chātur-māsya, or year divided into periods of four months each, and are named (1) Vāja (the strong), the artist of the gods, the Vaishvadeva or village- (Vish) gods of the spring season; (2) Vibhvan (the distinguished), the artist of Varuna god of the summer season; and (3) Ribhukshan (the master (ksha) of the Ribhus), the artist of Indra to whom the autumn and winter season called Sāka-medha is dedicated.² The year made by them is described in the *Rigveda*, IV., 33, 3-7, as that which closed with the 'twelve days' rest of the Ribhus in the house of Agchya, the Pole-star god of the South, the resting-place of the south-west sun of winter. The rest of the Ribhus, the makers of the seasons of the year of the sun-god Ra, is the exact equivalent of the twelve days during which the Phœnician sun-god Ar-chal, the conquering (chal) Ar or Ra, lay on the funeral pyre, before he woke up to be the new-born sun-god of the New Year, or the 2nd of Peritius, the 25th of December.³ This year in which the sun-god, reborn at the winter solstice, reached his time of strength at the vernal equinox and began his annual spring combat with the gods of frost and darkness,

¹ H. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der Alten Ägypter*, pp. 158-160.

² *Rig.* iv. 33, 3-9. Eggeling's *Sat. Brāh.* ii. 5, 5, 1; ii. 6, 1, 48. *S. B. E.* vol. xii. pp. 384-437.

³ Möyer, *Die Phönizier*, vol. i. chap. x. p. 386.

was ended by his final victory at the summer solstice. The rule of the conquering sun lasted till the autumnal equinox, when the time of his winter decrepitude, and the year of the feast of the dead of the barley-growing races, began after the three-season year of the Ribhus became one of four. This first year of the Ribhus was therefore one of 360 days, the complete solar circle divided into twelve lunar months each of twenty-nine days, making 348 days; and to these twelve days were added for the winter rest of the sun-god, answering to the twelve days allotted to the moon-god by the one day in each month exceeding the twenty-eight days required for the waxing and waning moons. This is the year of the Hindu Karāṇas in its original form preserved in the naming of the days, for in it the fourteenth of the month was called Chaudahi with the same meaning, while the fifteenth, the day of rest, is called Purnimā Panchāyī, the completed fifteen. After it the days are named in a fresh numerical series up to the second Chaudahi, or fourteenth, or the twenty-ninth of the month.¹

This year was changed by the victory of Indra, the successor of the old god Sek-Nāg—the Indra of the *Rigveda*—over Vyāsa or Vyāsa, and the record of the change is preserved in that verse of the Vedic hymn to the Ribhus which I have already quoted (*Rigveda*, IV. 33, 5), in which Ribhuksha, the artist of Indra, is said to have exclaimed, "Let us make four cups," or four seasons. In this new year the autumn was intercalated between the summer and winter season, and it began with the new season at the autumnal equinox. This change in the year-reckoning arose out of a change in the conception of how time should be calculated.

The first year of three seasons was the year of the growing plants, the tree trunk or plant stem impregnated with the life-giving rain, which descended from heaven in the three seasons of sowing, growing, ripening, and storing. It was called the Drona or Jar, and the Ka-drū or tree (dru) of Ka, the Hindu queen of the serpent races. This tree-year is described in the *Brāhmanas* as the year of the arrow which wounded the Soma bird, with its feather the spring season, the shaft the summer, and the quickening barb the winter.² It is the year of the original Kaduceus of the Greek Hermes, of the Gnomon pillar (ἔρμυ), the offspring of the Kados or Jar, called in Homer τριπίτηλος—that is, the three-leaved growing plant with its two cotyledons and central plumule.³ The whole became the sacred three-leaved shamrock. This shamrock is the life-giving plant with which in the *Niblunga Saga* Sig-Mund, the conquering (sig) moon (mund), restored to life his son Sinfjötli, the sinew (sin) chain (fjötli), the year of ten lunar months of gestation, after he had

¹ Sachau's *Albirun's India*, vol. ii. chap. lxxviii. p. 197.

² *Āit. Brāh.* i. 25. Eggeling's *Sat. Brāh.* iii. 4, 4, 14-17. *S. B. E.* vol. xxvi. p. 108, note 2.

³ *Hom. Merc.* 350.

slain him in his madness.¹ This age of the madness of Sigmund and his son was that in which the twain ravaged the world as two wolves, and were the wolf parents of the age of the Twin gods, when time was reckoned by the ten lunar months of gestation, when the Greek Apollo, the wolf sun-god, and his twin sister Artemis, the goddess of the constellation of the Great Bear, were born as twin children of the wolf-mother Lato or Leto, worshipped as a tree trunk. This is the year of the Egyptian Ankh, in which the central leaf of the triplet is depicted as the world's egg impregnated by the staff of the Kaduceus, the fire-drill turned by the crosspiece, the two arms of the cross, the two lunar crescents measuring the months.

This staff of the Kaduceus was the movable fire-drill of heaven, only distinguishable by the rising, culminating, and setting stars and sun, which turned round with it in its daily revolution. It was in Hindu astronomy fixed on the island of Lanka (Ceylon), and was originally, as will be seen farther on, the world's tree whence the wind-ape, the southern star Canopus, the Hindu Agastya, moved the outer skin of the world's egg, the encircling heavens, and thus made the stars and sun revolve. But in the second conception of the revolving year-tree, due to the introduction of fire worship, it was Canopus who turned round the tree while the heavens remained stationary, the stars seeming to follow its motions as the branches of a tree follow the gyrations of the trunk. When the conception of the turning of the world's tree was changed by the Finn immigrants, believers in the mother-mountain and the mother-bird, into the turning mountain with the staff on the top, the bamboo pole of Vasu, it was thought to be turned by the seven winds and to revolve in the circle by which the fire-drill entered the egg, the polar arch of the constellation Rahab or Draco. It was from this egg so impregnated that the Kushite race, the sons of the egg laid by Gandhārī the vulture-mother, were born. This was the egg of the Pole-star mother, the egg of iron² encircled by the metal-clad heavens of the Bronze Age, and the star was that called Vega in the Vulture constellation, now called Lyra, which was the Pole-star from 10,000 to 8000 B.C. The fire-drill which impregnated it was the south-west wind bringing the monsoon, the wind of the black Bindo-bird, the black crow star Canopus, who was called both the great ape and the black crow. The constellation of the Ribhus which watched this process of fertilisation completed first in the three seasons of the arrow year of the corn-growing race and afterwards in the ten lunar months of gestation of the age of the Twins, was that called in the *Rigveda* Shinshu-Māra, meaning the alligator. It is described in the Vishnu Dharma as the constellation which turns the stars round the Pole as a man turns the beam of the

¹ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. ii. essay viii, pp. 117, 214.

² *Mahābhārata* Adi (Sambhava) Parva, cxv. p. 338.

revolving oil-press. The figure ascribed in the Vishnu Dharma to this turning constellation of the Alligator is that of a man, a reminiscence of the great father ape. The Ashvins, the twin stars Gemini, the physicians of the gods, are said to be its hands. This constellation is said in the *Rigveda* to be joined with that of the Bull (Vrisabha) in drawing the chariot of the Ashvins to the house of the national King Divodāsa.¹ This name Divodāsa means the ten (dasha) bright ones—the ten lunar months of gestation, personified also in the name of Dasa-ratha, the ten chariots (rutha), the husband of Kushaloya, the Kushika mother and father of Rāma.

This last story is, like so many other myths of the star-gazing and astronomical tribes who civilised India and South-west Asia, a story of the reckoning of the year. It tells how the stars Gemini—the Ashvins or heavenly horsemen, the turners of the earth on its axis as the heavenly fire-drill—were taken round the Pole by the constellations of the Alligator and the bull Taurus, the Hindu Push, which began the year, as it still continues to do, as the month beginning with the winter solstice. They were accompanied in their chariot by the sun-maiden, and the course of the year was marked by the fourteen stars of the Alligator constellation, enumerated in the Vishnu Dharma, the stars marking the periods of the lunar phases. The course of the chariot was through the lunar months up to Bhadrāpada, also called Prosthāpada, the foot (pada) of the Ox, the tenth month from the winter solstice, when the sun-maiden was married by the Ashvins to Pūshan the barley-god, a marriage recorded in *Rigveda*, VI. 58, 4. It was at the autumnal equinox falling at the end of this month that the young sun of the barley-growing races, who had been conceived at the winter solstice, was born. He was the god of the Greek cross, depicting by its four equal arms the year divided into four equal seasons by the equinoxes and solstices. The month of his birth is consecrated in Hindu astronomy² to the dominants Aja ekapād, the one-footed goat, the blessed (bhadrā) foot, to which the month owes one of its names, and which supports the earth (*Rig.* I. 67, 5), and the Ahi Budhnya, the earth-snake, which lies below the goat as the Sek or Shesh Nāg, the wet snake encircling the earth and ocean—a Hindu form of the Midgard-serpent of the *Edda*. His name, derived from budhna, the depth, shows that it was an exact equivalent of the Greek prophet-serpent Python, from the root Buthos, the deep. This was the serpent of the era which inspired the priestesses of Delphi, the sacred shrine of Apollo, the dolphin-fish sun-god, who was, as we shall see, the direct descendant of the alligator god. The month of the birth of this bull-begotten sun-god, consecrated to the goat-god of generation and the goats said to draw the chariot of Pūshan (*Rig.* I. 38, 4, VI.

¹ *Rig.* 116, 18.

² Sachau's *Albiruni's India*, vol. ii. chap. lxi. p. 122.

55, 3, 4), was that of the birth of the sun-calf of the year of 360 days, whose begetting and birth are recorded in the hymn (*Rig. I. 164*) which I have already quoted. It was also the birth month of the earlier goat-god of the Hittite races, who first introduced this new fashion of reckoning time by the ten lunar months of gestation; and that this conclusion is correct is proved by the universal prevalence throughout the barley-growing countries of South-western Asia and Greece, of the year beginning at the autumnal equinox and dedicated to the barley-eating fathers of the trading race, called the Khati or joined race, the same name as the Hittites bore in Assyria and Egypt, where they were called the Kheta or Khita. It was they who gave these names to the maritime province of Khātiawār, where the Yādava seaport, Dwārika, was founded after Baragya (Bharoch) and Surpāraka (Surat), of which I have already spoken. Their goat-god, worshipped before the later ploughing bull, was the goat-god Uz of the Akkadians, the god Usof, the hunting god of the green pillar which stood with the golden sun pillar before the Phœnician temples, and who was said to have invented ship-building.¹ His priests were, like the Hindu Vaishya or trading races, clothed in goatskins. He is depicted on Babylonian monuments as holding in his hand a ring, the Roman annus or year ring of the ten lunar months of gestation, and a thunderbolt, the sign of the storm-bird. This, like his name, Uz, which is a form of Uk, the name of the Finnish mother-bird Ukko, proves him to be a mythological successor of the storm-bird, the Akkadian Lugaltudda. He sits on a throne watching the revolutions of the solar disk round the Pole; this is placed on a table, the tortoise-earth, and made to turn round by a rope,² the constellation Draco, of which the two turning hands are the Ashvins, the stars Gemini, and this constellation is, as we shall see, also called Chitrangada or the variegated necklace.

These Khati, who still survive as one of the richest trading clans in the Punjab and Western India, were thus the race who consecrated the month ending with the autumnal equinox, first to the goat-god and afterwards to the ox, and looked on it as the birth month of the sun-god who ruled their year. It was their successors, the sons of the sun-horse, who consecrated the next month, Ashvayujau—September-October—to the Twin horsemen as the eleventh month of gestation of the sun-horse. Thus we see that the very ancient system of the Hindu months which contain traces of all the religious revolutions of the land is based on the early theology of the trading Khati, or joined races of the North and South, who reckoned by the lunar months of gestation and were united by the

¹ Möyer: *Die Phönizier*, vol. i. pp. 294-304.

² Sayce *Hibbert Lectures* for 1887. Lect. iv. p. 284.

constellation of the Ribhus, the Babylonian Ribū, the Hebrew constellation of the Dragon or Alligator called Rahab.

It was on the introduction of the conception of reckoning time by the lunar months of gestation, and the substitution of the ploughing ox, the black cloud-ox Pūshan, for the goat as the father of the sun-god, that the year was changed to one of four seasons. In this new method of reckoning the sun did not awake up from his twelve days' sleep to conscious life at the winter solstice, but he as the son of the cloud-ox was conceived at the winter solstice as the son of the tree-mother, the mother goddess Kadrū and Drona of the Kados, or Jar, the naked tree-trunk whence the Kaduceus was born. He, as the introducer of a new belief that the sun and not the moon and stars were the authors of life, assumed the form of a new animal totem, the sun-ram. He thus became the Syrian sun-god depicted on the Palmyrene altar as the ram issuing from the cypress-tree, and the Buddha sun-god of India, born from the Sak-tree (*Shorea robusta*), the parent tree of the Dravidian races, which his mother held at his birth. He was also called in Phœnicia Eshmun, the eighth god.

He was the offspring of the Hindu god Daksha, meaning the shown or visible god, the god of the Green Gnomon, the tree-pillar of Usof, who was the father of the thirteen wives of Kashyapa, the father god of the Kushite race, the thirteen lunar months of the year, which succeeded that of ten and eleven months. The thirteenth of these wives and the last month of the year was Kadrū, the tree (dru) of Ka, the tree trunk of the sun-bearing tree. Kadrū was the mother of the thousand Nāgas, the race who, like the Egyptian kings, wore on their foreheads the image of the Nāga snake as their totem mark and a sign of royal dignity. These Nāgas were a ploughing race who took their name from the Gond Nagur, a plough, the name given by them to the constellation of the Great Bear, ruling the seven days of the lunar week. This was the week reckoned by Hermes, the god of the pillar (ἔρμυς) or tree trunk, who placed the seven strings of the lyre on the shell of the tortoise, and thus made the constellation of the mother-Vulture of the Kushika first into that of the tortoise Kush, and afterwards into that of Lyra, the name by which it is now known. This was the week which in the year of gestation of ten lunar months succeeded the fourteen days of the lunar periods by which the first year of the Ribhus, the alligator, was measured.

This new year contained forty weeks, the number sacred to the Akkadian fish-god Ia and the Hebrew Jehovah. This was the first year of the daughters of Daksha ending with the month consecrated to Yīnatā, the tenth wife of Kashyapa. Her name means she who is bowed down, and she and Kadrū were the only conceiving mothers.

Vinatā brought forth two eggs, the undeveloped egg Aruna, meaning the fire-drill, of which the upper half assumed a human form while the lower half, the fire-socket, remained an unvitalised yolk. This was an image of the male father revolving as the fire-drill in the north, while beneath him in the south were the undeveloped embryos of coming life, which were brought into existence by the heat generated in his daily gyrations as he moved round driven by the rain-giving south-west wind. The other egg was the bird Gadura, meaning the bull (gud) of light, the flying sun-bull which guarded the gates of the palaces of the Assyrian kings,¹ and it was the bird of Kadrū, the mother of the fully-developed year as contrasted with the year of gestation of the half-developed Aruna.

Daksha, the father god of the cosmogony based on lunar months, is represented both with a goat's and a ram's head, and is called in India Mendh Ishwara, the ram (mendh or menrh) creator.² He is thus the exact equivalent even in name of the Egyptian form of Osiris, worshipped at Mendes as the goat and ram god called the Mendhesian goat, a form of worship which must have been brought to Egypt by the Turano-Dravidian Khati, or Hittite-Phœnician trading merchants. It was also taken by them to Greece, where in Arcadia Hermes, the god of the pillar, was worshipped as the god Kriophoros and Mosthophoros, the bearer of the ram (κρίός), and the sun-calf, or the sucker of a plant (μούσχος). Also the sun-ram was sacred to Baal Hammon, the Phœnician god of the pillar.³ It was the ram of the Golden Fleece of the legend of Jason, who circled the world as the sun-physician in the star ship the constellation Argo,⁴ and it was the animal called Varuna's victim in the ritual of the Brahminic sacrifice to Varuna, the god of the summer season.⁵ It is this ram sun-god who is the father of the sun-lamb yearly offered in Bulgaria and Greece on St. George's Day⁶ to the plough-god Georgos, the worker (Ourgos) of the earth, the equivalent of the Indian plough-god Nagur. He is also in Hebrew historical mythology represented as the son of Rahab the alligator,⁷ for Boaz, the golden pillar of Solomon's temple—the Phœnician god Baal Hammon—was the son of Rahab.

It was in the age of the first year of Daksha, the year of forty weeks and ten lunar months of gestation, that the new autumn season of the sun-god born at the autumnal equinox was added by

¹ *Mahābhārata* *Adi* (*Astika*) *Parva*, xvi. pp. 75 ff.

² Elliot's *Supplementary Glossary*, s.v. Mens, a boundary, p. 249.

³ *Paus.* ix. 2. 1. Bérard, *Origine des Cultes Arcadiens*, chap. iv. *Le Dieu fils*, pp. 297-299.

⁴ For the voyage of the *Argo*, see Hewitt's *Ruling Races of the Prehistoric Times*, vol. ii. essay viii. pp. 180 ff.

⁵ Eggeling's *Sat. Brāh.* ii. 5, 2, 15, 16. *S. B. E.* vol. xii. p. 395.

⁶ Garnett and Stuart Glennie, *Women of Turkey*, chap. xii. pp. 332, 333.

⁷ *Matt.* i. 5.

Ribhuksha, the master of the Ribhu. This year, which was that universally then reckoned through all the barley-growing countries from Greece to India, is that still observed by the Jews. They begin their year on the first new moon after the autumnal equinox, or the first of the month Tisri, and announce its opening by blasts blown on trumpets of ram's horn. This opening year was ruled, as we are told in the Akkadian astronomy of the Tablets of the Thirty Stars, by the star called "The Lord of Seed in the month 'Tisri," the "Lugaltudda" or storm-bird. This star, as Mr. Brown has shown, is Antares (α Scorpio),¹ and this, according to Dr. Sayce, is the star of the Akkadian mountain-goddess Istar, the daughter (tar) of the heaven's mountain (is) who represents the constellation Scorpio under the name of Ishkara.²

But in this dedication of the primæval mother-mountain goddess to the constellation Scorpio, we find distinct evidence of the total change in religion brought about by the shepherd races, who substituted the year of months for the year of seasons measured by the earlier votaries of the hunting-star Orion and the constellation of the Alligator. The transformations of Istar in these changes of faith are marked by her Akkadian name Sak, the wet goddess, and by that of Rahābu, the alligator-mother. She is also as lady of the dawn called Bis-bizi, a reduplicated form of Pes, a pig, the ancient sacred animal of Phrygia and Greece, and she was thus the alligator-goddess³ of the early sun-god of the barley-growers, Rāhu, to whom pigs are still always offered by her Dosadh priests in the alligator land of Maghada, the modern Behar. Her equivalent in this phase of her historical changes is the Buddhist goddess of Thibet called the Vajra-varāhi, the Sow of the thunderbolt (vajra), who is Marichi the wife of Haya-griva, the horse-necked (griva) god of the sun-horse. She has three faces, the three seasons of the year, and eight hands, the rays of the eight-rayed star. Her left face is that of a sow, and she sits upon a lotus throne drawn by seven swine, the seven stars of the Great Bear,⁴ which here appears as a parent constellation of the age of the deification of the pig. In this picture of the pig-mother goddess we have a clear identification of the course of Indian history, for Marichi, who is one of the stars of the Great Bear which, as we see, was that of the seven pigs, was the father of Kashyapa and the contemporary of Daksha, the father of his wives; also the sun-horse who, as the husband of the Buddhist sow-goddess, is the ancient boar-god the Varāha avatar of Krishna, who was the boar-god slain by Indra in the *Rigveda* for stealing the

¹ R. Brown, junr., F.S.A., "The Tablet of the Thirty Stars," Star xxiii. *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Feb. 1891.

² Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures* for 1887. Lect. p. 301.

³ *Ibid.* Lect. iv. p. 258, note 2.

⁴ Waddell, *The Buddhism of Thibet*, p. 361.

food of the gods before he was the black antelope-god of the seven antelope stars of the Great Bear, and who is there called the three-headed, six-eyed bear of the year of three seasons, divided into the weeks of six days sacred to the goddess Kadrū of the six days' Tri-kadrū-ka festival.¹ He was the Phœnician boar-god who slew Adonis and the Greek Calydonian boar who wounded in the foot the vulnerable part of the sun-god ruling the year, Odusseus²—he who was, like Adonis, first the hunting-star Orion and afterwards the sun-god. It was by this wound that he was recognised as the sun-god by Eurn-kleia or Eurn-nomel, the Pole-star mother goddess his nurse.³ She, as M. Bérard has shown, was the Akkadian fish-mother goddess, who was originally the Pole-turning Alligator, the goddess who turned the South Pole from her home in the waters, the goddess Dictynna of the heavenly net which maintains her in the air. She with the Phœnician Thetis, goddess of clay (thith), the floor of the ocean, concealed Hephaistos the fire-god for nine years, that is, for nine months of gestation, after he had been cast out of heaven by Zeus. She was the Phœnician goddess Ast-Naama, the beautiful virgin who became in Crete Brito-martis, the virgin (martis) of the cypress-tree (Berut), the mother of the sun-god.⁴ We thus see that the avatar of the boar-sun and the sow-mother, goddess of the seven stars of the Great Bear, denoted the year of the Alligator which intervened before the year of the goat and of the ten lunar months of gestation, and which was the year of the Ribhus and of the Hindu Karanas which I have described. When the Pole-star goddess Rahūbn was transferred from the constellation of the Alligator to be the supreme goddess of the new faith whose ruling star was Antares (α Scorpio) guarding the moon-goddess Astoreth, she became the goddess of the shepherd races who tended goats, sheep, and cattle, and looked on pigs, the holy animals of the former age, as unclean. This change is marked in Hebrew Kushite mythology by their restricting the cult of the antelope and pig to the one yearly feast on their totem animals, which was celebrated in Egypt, the land ruled by Kushite kings, on the 15th Pachon, about the 31st March. It answered to the sacrifice of swine offered yearly on the 2nd April to Aphrodite, the goddess of Paphos, where her image was a triangular stone representing the year of three seasons.⁵

¹ *Rig. i.* 61, 7; x. 99, 6. Hewitt, *The History of the Week*, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July 1897, pp. 16-19.

² A similar instance of the sun-god wounded in the foot was Achilles, slain by the arrow of Paris which pierced his vulnerable heel. In the story of Odusseus' wound, he was also slain by the boar as the ruling star Orion of the year of three seasons, but was revived as the counselling god of the age of the Twins.

³ *Od.* xix. 466-509; xxi. 219, 220. ⁴ *Hom. Il.*, xviii. 394-411. Bérard, *Origine des Cultes Arcadiens*, chap. ii. *Les Déeses*, pp. 98-104, 154, 155.

⁵ H. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der Alten Ägypter*, p. 462. *Herod.* ii. 47.

It was to mark the change of faith that on the amalgamation of the shepherd Hittites with the farming villagers, who were Pole-star worshippers, the Hittite rulers of the new alliance changed the banner of the Jewish tribe of Dan, the sons of the Pole-star god, from the alligator Rahab to that of the scorpion, and made the star of the Scorpion the ruler of their year.

This year beginning under the constellation of the Scorpion was that in which Isis, the Egyptian counterpart of Istar, gave birth as the cow-mother, the moon-goddess, to the sun-god Horus, who had in his former birth been the son of Hat-hor, the sun-hawk. In his new birth he was born in the papyrus marshes of Buto, near the crocodile city of Pisui, to which his mother was led by the seven scorpions Bene, Mastet, Mastetef, Petit, Thetet, and Matet.¹ The new year festival of the sun-god, thus born under the sign of the seven Scorpions, was that held at Antioch at the autumnal equinox to celebrate the death and re-birth of Tammuz, the Phœnician form of the Akkadian Dumu-zi, the son (dumu) of life (zi), the star Orion, who became, as the sun-god of the barley-growing Phœnicians, Eshmun, the eighth. The women mourned his death and sought his body for seven days; on the eighth day they found the dead god revived in the barley, wheat, lettuce, and fennel, which had sprouted from the seed they had sown in the wooden boxes called Adonidos kēpoi, the gardens of Adonis, which they distributed to every house. These plants were the earthly images of the young sun-god of the barley-growing races born from the Soma cask, the tree trunks and plant stems, called Drona and Kadrū, which gave life to the new totem god who was to be eaten as the bread of life in the sacramental tribal meal partaken of on his birth festival. It was on the eighth day of this feast that the phallus of the newly born sun-god, made like the Greek phallus of Bacchus of fig wood, was drawn by oxen to the temple. And the consecration of this phallus made, like the wooden image of the Gond god Sek Nag, of the parent tree, the tree-mother of the Syrians and Hindus, is a distinct mark of the national advance in practical scientific knowledge. The use of the fig as the fruit tree which grows most readily from cuttings instead of seed denotes the adoption of this new mode of propagation by the scientific gardeners, who were now beginning to improve the wild fruit trees as their fathers had changed the wild grasses into edible corn.

This festival of the birth of the young sun-god from the sprouting barley is repeated in India, as I have already shown elsewhere, in

Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, Lect. viii. p. 273. Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. pp. 180, 181.

¹ H. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der Alten Ägypter*, pp. 402, 404. Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay ii. pp. 66, 67.

the Kurrum festival of the Oraors and Kharwars, in which the daughters of the village head man present those who dance round the Kurrum almond-tree, a reproduction of the almond-tree sacred to the Jews, with barley shoots grown from river sand mixed with turmeric.¹

J. F. HEWITT.

¹ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. p. 223.

REVOLUTION IN MONEY MATTERS.

IN the days when the present generation was young, a bright idea got into people's minds; they thought and sang very heartily (Charles Mackay's song, "There's a Good Time Coming!") That was when the Corn Laws were newly repealed, and when free trade and plenty of it was looked forward to with good hope. Times did get better then, and continued good for awhile. The home trade and most of the industries of the country improved, wages began to rise as profits rose, and commerce with foreign countries increased by leaps and bounds. But unfortunately an unexpected calamity came upon this country. In the year 1846 the great failure in the potato crop occurred, and as the Irish peasantry were dependent upon that crop for their sustenance and support, and everything else, that failure was a dreadful calamity to Ireland. In these sad circumstances the British Government most considerately and sympathetically stepped forward and gave national help to the Irish people to carry them through their disaster and distress. The first thing that was done for them was to order a great quantity of grain and food from America to make up for the want of the potatoes. Indian corn, wheat, and other breadstuffs were hurried across the Atlantic in fast steamers in immense quantities from America to Ireland by Government orders and by merchants, so as to save the lives of the famine-stricken people: that was a blessed act of national kindness not to be forgotten!

It has been stated that about ten million pounds worth of grain and food was imported from the United States to meet the Irish famine. That importation had all to be paid for in some way or other. There is no doubt Great Britain could pay for that heavy purchase; but when it came to be considered how that could be done it was a puzzle to financiers and to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The fact was it threw the bankers in Lombard Street into a panic, and brought on a financial crisis in the affairs of this country which put trade and commerce out of gear entirely, all for want of a proper system of finance to pay the ten millions of "ready money" to America for, or balance the account for, the imported corn. If a Pitt had been at the helm in 1847 he would have managed to have squared accounts between Britain and America very simply, by getting Parliament to allow at once the Bank of England

to issue what notes were required for the circulating medium of this country in place of gold coin. That would have allowed the Bank to send the gold to America as wanted without any difficulty or derangement of trade, and without raising the rate of discount upon its home customers at all. Indeed, if it had not been for the restrictions put upon the Bank by the Act of 1814, there might have been no monetary panic in 1847 to face. The same may be said of the panics of 1857 and 1866, when the Bank Act had likewise to be suspended when runs for gold took place which the Bank was not prepared to meet, therefore the Bank was allowed to increase its issue of notes so as to supply ready money to carry on the home trade with, and to enable bankers to accommodate their customers with proper credit and cash. Alas! the fetters were soon put on again.

In previous articles we have plainly pointed out how much the Bank Acts handicap trade and commerce. The present restricted system hinders free trade rather than helps it. It is therefore urgently necessary that a complete revolution should be made in money matters, in order that bankers may be brought to understand that banks are meant to *serve* the public in the *first place*, and that bankers must now act upon free-trade principles like other business men, and study their customers' interests as well as their own. Free banking will most likely lower the rate of interest for the loan of capital or credit, and that will be a great benefit to all commercialists and traders, manufacturers and agriculturists, merchants and miners, &c. There must be banks for the common people as well as for the upper classes. The savings banks should be made lending banks as well as deposit banks, so that the thrifty working-classes, who have an immense amount of money lying locked up uselessly in the old style of savings banks, may be enabled to turn their money to better account by investing it in industrial companies and businesses where they will receive a good return for their savings, in addition to the wages they have wrought for, as is the case in Germany, France, America, and Canada, as I have seen. As an example, there is an agricultural bank going to be started in Scotland with £250,000 capital and other small banks likewise.

London bankers and writers of financial articles have been for so long time led to believe that the Bank of England is a model bank, and that whatever it does is right, and that it is for the public advantage that it should have all the exclusive privileges it has—such as being the only bank allowed to issue bank-notes in London, or within sixty-five miles thereof—that no one contradicts them; whereas the Bank is, in truth, the greatest hindrance to freedom of exchange existing. The English country banks are deprived of their liberty, like dogs in chains. It is to be hoped all country banks will get full liberty to issue notes by-and-by on

securities. At a meeting of the Bankers' Institute, London, Mr. Robert Williams, M.P., the president, said: "With regard to amalgamations, we are evidently nearing the time when all banking business in England may be monopolised by half-a-dozen powerful Institutions, *as is the case in Scotland now.*" He said the shares of English banks had risen to 225 per cent. against 210 per cent. twelve months ago. Mr. A. S. Harvey, of Messrs. Glyn's Bank, said: "If the Klondyke fields should pour into the markets of Europe anything like the amount of gold which is expected, we may before long enter into a second run of depreciation"; and he thinks some wonderful changes will take place in regard to a quarter ounce of gold being held to be the infallible standard of value for a legal pound:

"Old opinions, rags and tatters,
Get you gone! get you gone!
Set banks free and money matters!
Let trade go freely on."

The welfare of the working class as well as employers is so very dependent upon the moneyed classes and bankers that it is of the utmost importance to them to have the very best monetary system that can be invented to supply capital, or money to carry on business with, as cheap as possible. The best way to obtain this desideratum is to throw the business of banking open and do away with any monopoly. If business men would form banking associations for mutual benefit, then the monopolist bankers might be driven to the bridge of sighs!

Another important thing is that our Government should adopt a monetary system for our home currency totally independent of gold. Gold bullion should be left to be dealt with at such a price as it will find in the market. Then this country could cause foreigners to open their markets to us as freely as we open our markets to them. For instance, if the Germans, or any other foreigners, sent more of their produce or stuffs into our markets than they would take goods from us in exchange, and would take nothing but gold in payment, we would be in a position to charge them such a price for our gold as would be equivalent to the price of our goods. Supposing they sent us lots of beet-sugar very cheap in order to get our gold, we could stop that imposition by making them pay through the bankers so much higher for our gold if they would not take our goods. Then they would soon find out that they had better deal with us on free-trade principles by honest reciprocity.

In the same manner we should treat with the United States of America; that is to say, make free trade in gold bullion our rule. Then they would either have to pay us such a price for gold as we would put on it to pay ourselves properly, or otherwise they would be obliged to take our goods, &c., in exchange for their corn, cotton,

tobacco, &c., at our regular prices. There would be no way of imposing their protective and prohibitive duties on our goods then, for the more duties they laid upon our goods, so much more premium they would have to pay upon getting gold from us, if they would take nothing else in exchange. The truth is, our Government could stop the Americans from dealing unfairly with this country if we would adopt free trade in gold bullion.

Lord Masham has made a bitter speech against the American tariffs, and very properly too; but the Americans are not altogether to blame. *We have ourselves to blame likewise.* Americans send us a great deal more of their produce than they take goods from us in exchange. How do they get payment for the extra amount of their exports? They take it in gold, or as much as they can in that way; but if *we* would let gold rise to an equivalent premium at the Bank of England, that would drive the Americans to reduce their excessive tariffs on our goods, or otherwise they would get less money from us for their exports or pay a higher premium for our gold. Lord Masham should, therefore, get our Government to adopt free trade in gold, and with that he would get his unequalled goods into America in spite of all the McKinleyites.

It was an egregious mistake to enact that a piece of gold of a certain weight and fineness should always be of the same value in this country and pass for *one pound of legal money*. We see that gold is a commodity that fluctuates in quantity and value like other metals; therefore it is not suited to be a "standard of value" for our currency. Adam Smith settled that long ago, and approved of good bank-notes, or notes issued by authority of the Government, being used for the circulating medium. This system was adopted in Scotland, when banks were started there 200 years ago, and was also adopted in England, and was successful so far, but under restrictions and subject to the Bank of England monopoly, which is not yet relaxed. The currency of this country should rather consist of British Treasury notes than Bank of England notes. The Government is the best security that can be given for notes, and best entitled to get the profit thereof. But all banks of the country might be authorised to issue their own notes also, in suitable denominations, upon lodging securities with the Treasury for their issues.

The great rush of emigrants to the new goldfields of Klondyke shows that there are thousands of people who value gold at a higher rate than their own lives, not to speak of the exchangeable value of the yellow metal at all. Gold may fall to be as cheap as lead, for silver, only a few years ago, was worth twice as much as now; gold may depreciate likewise. What, then, will all the gold of Klondyke be worth to the digger? It must not be supposed that the price of gold will keep up to the present standard in England. The gold bullion will just have to be sold in the markets at what it will bring,

and if the Bank of England, the Bank of France, the German Bank, the Treasury of Russia, and the Treasury of the United States cease to continue to lay up more millions of bullion, who else will buy it? Furthermore, if paper money is generally adopted in civilised countries, and gold coin is not wanted for home circulation, there is no saying how low the price of gold may fall, as measured against the standard paper money of Great Britain or any other great nation, which is the real criterion. There are as good mines in Britain as there are in Alaska. If our mines are well wrought, they may be made as profitable as those of Klondyke, everything considered, and certainly with far more comfort and sociality than is to be found outside of civilised life. At these diggings there is only the roughest work, in a pitiless Arctic climate, to wrest from the frozen earth stuff that will scarcely pay to bring it to the money markets.

Considering the numerous advantages which would accrue to the public from a better system of banking and currency, which would give people the full use of the great wealth and capital in this country, it is wonderful that a reform of the antiquated monetary system has been so long delayed in England. It has often been pointed out, by commercial men especially, that the first reform should be to break up the monopoly of the Bank of England and establish a national or British Treasury Bank to do all the Government banking business and to issue national notes, in place of the Bank of England notes, and, if the people pleased, instead of the gold coin also. The nation would be good for any amount of obligations, including its issue of national notes, therefore gold might be dispensed with for home circulation, though it might be kept in reserve for foreign exchange and on deposit, but should only be bought and sold at market prices, not at fixed prices as now. Then a one pound national note would be a better "standard of value" than a sovereign is, because it would always be good for its face value and pass current for one pound throughout the British realm, while gold would fluctuate, no person knows how much now since Klondyke is discovered!

It is time to be setting our monetary system in order ere gold slumps down. If national notes are made the standard money, as they should be, there need be no more panics for the want of money, as has been too often the case since the statute of 1816 was passed. The great monetary panics of 1847, 1857, 1866, and the depression of 1875 were the results of that policy. The price of the commodity *gold* should be allowed to fluctuate like other commodities. Then the rates of interest for loans and discounts at banks would be steady and reasonable for trading with, as the rate of interest would just be regulated according to the money markets in Lombard Street and in country banks, irrespective of gold. Then there would always be enough of ready money to be had at the banks; nevertheless the

banks would take care they did not make advances without security. There would just be enough of money put into circulation and no more, as is the case in Scotland. There would be no need for hoarding up gold uselessly in banks—national notes are better. The Treasury would withdraw Consols for the same amount as the notes it issued. That would cancel so much National Debt! The other banks might be authorised to issue notes also for Consols. This would give an immense impetus to all trades and industries, and would bring the tremendous amount of dead stock of wealth in this country into activity and give full employment to all heads and hands. This would meet the great desideratum of the present times.

Surely the time has come for a legislative revolution in monetary matters!

ROBERT EWEN.

TO ZOLA.

(February 23, 1898.)

ZOLA ! this day doth weave around thy brow
The martyr's crown, and, with the crown, the fame
Of those who suffer in the sacred name
Of Liberty. The challenge thou didst throw
In the oppressor's face perchance did show
Too white with anger ; yet when hearts lie tame
'Neath wrongs, they need, to rouse them from their shame,
A strong man's voice, full-fired with passion's glow.
Hence in the coming years, when Liberty
In flesh and blood, not the vain word, doth dwell
With France, this land shall own its debt to thee ;
And as sires show their sons how heroes fell
To leave to France this peerless legacy,
Then also Zola's name its tale shall tell.

[STANLEY YOUNG.

HEREDITY AND THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

The Duke of Argyll, replying to a correspondent, writes:—"One thing is clear, that is, that non-elected men and non-elected institutions may be quite as representative as elected. . . . I am not an ultra-Darwinian, but I am sure Darwin was right in attributing to heredity immense power in nature. The inheritance of great traditions among people which has not been made but developed out of continuous history is a glorious inheritance and of infinite value in all steady progress. It is nothing but shallow thinking which attacks what is called the hereditary principle."

THE Duke of Argyll, it appears, is not an ultra-Darwinian, but is sure that Darwin was right in attributing to heredity immense power in nature. Therefore, says the Duke, you must not touch the House of Lords. Now, in the regions of a duke's intellect this may be good logic; but those of us who are not dukes or earls, or barons or marquises, or otherwise entitled to write our signatures in one word, would prefer to examine this little syllogism and see if it be just altogether so conclusive as His Grace seems to think.

The first assumption is that Heredity has immense power in nature. Darwinians, ultra-Darwinians, and non-Darwinians alike admit that; only slight differences of opinion arise regarding the immensity of the power and the directions in which it is exercised. Heredity is a Power possessing a territory to which its rights are admitted by all, and a Hinterland where many a little skirmish has yet to be fought before other Powers will yield their claims to Heredity. As to the undisputed territory, we find that it is the natural expectation of mankind that in form and structure the offspring will resemble the parent. The fact that an animal or a plant is like those from which it sprung is so obvious, so common an experience, that, were it not that sometimes the young one differs a little from the old, we should call it an axiom, and say that we knew it before we were born, or some similar absurdity. So far the ground is undisputed. We may expect that if we sow barley we shall reap barley and not wheat, and that the foal of an ass will be an ass and not a pony. It does not need very close observation to notice the force of Heredity so far.

A little closer observation also will disclose the fact that the big barley grains will produce barley bearing big grains, and that the strong ass will produce a colt which will grow to be a strong ass. And similarly the sons of men will reproduce little physical peculiarities of their fathers—the colour of the hair, the shape of the nose, the general configuration of the features. But in this second stage we must at every step keep before our minds the words, *barring accidents*. In other words, while the offspring is nearly absolutely certain to resemble the parent in form and structure, yet in moulding the physical peculiarities other forces come into play. The big barley grain may have been dropped in bad soil, and have little beyond the husk to show for fruit; and the young ass may have been starved and neglected, and lost that promise of energy which its descent declared. And no one is surprised to see a tall son of short parents, or a short one of tall.

Does the expectation of Heredity extend from the physical to the mental world? Here we find a splendid link; for just as certain diseases like consumption are hereditary, so we find insanity, which is partly a physical disease and partly a mental trouble, can be and is transmitted from parent to offspring. Again, we often hear some person, who is speaking without having any theory on the subject to support, say of a child, "That's just his father over again," or, "That's just what his father would have done," or, "He's a chip of the old block." In what respects do they consider a child his father over again? In his intellectual powers, his power of acquiring knowledge and retaining it? Sometimes. In his will, its strength or weakness? Often. In his temper? Very often. In his disposition to fall into the same habits? Yes. In his tastes? Yes.

These resemblances we attribute to some inner influence acting on the boy, without his being conscious of it, and moulding him so that he shall be like his father. As he grows up, we expect him to resemble his father to a certain extent in his mental characteristics as well as in his bodily form.

But here we are on the debatable land. Before we can lay down a definite, positive statement that all these resemblances are wrought by the force of Heredity working unconsciously on the subject, we need a more careful observation than before. We must investigate the claims of the other powers. Before our arbitration court there appear Environment and Education to dispute the claim of Heredity to the whole of this territory. Their claims must be disposed of before we can assign this whole field to Heredity.

They base their claim chiefly on the fact that children are the greatest mimics on earth. Their first few years are spent in a half-conscious imitation of the ways of those around them. A boy, therefore, naturally falls into his father's peculiarities of voice, walk, and personal habits; he uses the same phraseology, he acquires the

same tastes, he puts on the same opinions (the illogical ones preferred), he will hoot the opponents of his father's political party, and fight the boys that go to another church. But we do not attribute these things to heredity. We never suppose that he has an inherited sense of the difference between Liberalism and Conservatism, nor that an unconscious inherited impulse moves him to prove the orthodoxy of *homooousios* "by apostolic blows and knocks" on the head of some little urchin who is impelled by a hereditary belief in the orthodoxy of *honorousios*. We say that he has learned these things from (or, more correctly, "off") his father.

The facts before the court, then, are these. In a child's intellectual powers, will, displays of temper or other emotions, dispositions, tastes, there are certain resemblances to those of his father. The advocates for Heredity urge that these are due to an unconscious impulse which determines that, were it not for education and environment, every child would be an exact *facsimile* of his father. The advocates for Environment and Education, on the other hand, hold that the resemblances are due to their action—viz, that kind of education which is most effective—the education which comes when a child is learning without thinking he is learning.

How is this point to be decided? Let us have evidence. A child that displays both hereditary tendency and knowledge that he learned "off" his father will not do. We must have a subject with only one of these. Now, if heredity works at all, it would be impossible to find any subject in which it is absent, for all children have fathers. But we may catch a boy who never learned anything "off" his father. Suppose we are fortunate enough to find a boy who never knew his father, nor heard of any of his peculiarities; suppose also that we were well acquainted with what his father had been like; we have now a perfect case—an *instantia crucis*—by which we may decide the point whether heredity has any foothold at all. Experienced observers have done so, and the sum of their observations is that there is such a thing as hereditary transmission of mental characteristics. A mathematician may be descended from a mathematician, thus showing that intellectual powers are transmissible. But the power of transmission is stronger in the regions of will and emotion. Children are born predisposed to be timorous, or to be passionate, or even to be intemperate. So that Heredity comes out of the court with a well established case.

But is Education defeated? By no means. If the sole cause that moulds a child's mind be heredity, then the schoolmaster's occupation is gone. In fact, we are in for predestination and fatalism at once. No, if ever a moral victory was won, Education has won it here. For by recognising that there are certain forces already in the child's mind, the educationist will strive to utilise them for his purpose or suppress them if they are opposed to it. For example, a

hereditary tendency to intemperance can never be utilised by any educator. He will suppress it. A tendency to anger may be directed in such a way that the anger becomes what is known as righteous indignation. This is playing with edged tools, however. An inquisitive tendency may be guided into a diligent search into the undiscovered secrets of nature.

Is the action of heredity uniform? Yes, in the same way as the action of gravity is uniform, in the same way as the fact that grass will grow on any portion of the earth's surface is uniform—*i.e., if nothing happens to prevent it.*

For example, grass would grow at Lat. 40 N., Long. 20 W., but cannot, for the Atlantic Ocean is there. Nor can we reasonably expect to find it at the North Pole, for most likely there are a good many fathoms of ice there. But the things that happen to prevent the action of heredity in character are more abundant. Every new influence brought to bear on a child, every new nurse or companion or teacher, either leads him on to be like his father or, what is more likely, to differ from him. An irascible man begets a son, but the irascible man is, let us say, a commercial traveller, and seldom at home. We may expect the child to inherit his father's bad temper, but this may be quite suppressed by the gentle influences and sweet dispositions of all he meets in childhood—nurses, companions, teachers, and others—so that people wonder how that child can be the son of such a peppery old gentleman. Or, on the other hand, the child of some brave seaman or fireman, of some man who never knew what fear was, may have his little mind wrought upon by some ignorant nurse with terrors and alarms so that he grows up a timorous lad of no spirit.

We may conclude, then, that there is undoubtedly a tendency for a child to resemble its parents in aptitudes for certain kinds of knowledge, in predispositions to certain kinds of emotional display, and in strength or weakness of will. But we must hold also that much that is commonly referred to heredity is due to the child's observation of the habits of its parents, and the assimilation, in a semi-conscious way, of the knowledge thus gained to the formation of its own personality. We must remember also that this tendency is so extremely modifiable by other influences that in many cases it never appears at all, in others it may be stamped out by judicious management, and in others it may be directed and fostered.

Whenever we mortals find a law in nature, our next question is, "Can we turn it to any practical use?" "Wonderful law that; what's the use of it?" Such is our attitude. Franklin, having discovered the laws of electrical action, proceeded to apply them in utilitarian fashion by inventing the lightning-rod to protect our houses from lightning. Galileo, having found out the laws of light and the properties of lenses, proceeded to invent a telescope. Here we have

got a psychological law of heredity : can we turn it to a practical use ?

'Tis very desirable. To possess a breed of citizens who should be capable of producing children destined to think great thoughts and to will noble deeds, simply because they are the sons of fathers who have thought and willed before them, would be a nobler possession for a country than veins of gold or diamond pans. These would be the men a nation could rely on to fill her pulpits, to teach in her schools, to expound her laws, to lead her armies, and wisely reform her statutes. To these we could entrust almost anything, from the administration of the Foreign Office to the clerkship of a Parish Council. But, alas ! the law of heredity is not an automatic machine. We must come back from our visions to the sober fact that it works only if nothing happens to prevent it, and that, as a matter of fact, innumerable things do happen to prevent it.

By the law of gravitation we should conclude that a stone thrown to the height of 20 feet will return to about the same level as it was thrown from. But if, in the course of its descent, it happens to fall on a flat roof or some projecting ledge, our expectations are deceived ; the law has not failed to work, but our particular case of it has been prevented by something. By a law of hydrostatics we expect that a certain pressure on one limb of a Bramah's press will raise a certain weight. But if there happens to be a leak in the press the weight does not rise. The law is not suspended, but something has happened to prevent its working, for the machine has broken down. Yet precautions can easily be taken to ensure the working of mechanical laws, in other words, to prevent breakdowns of machinery. Much of modern industry consists in seeing that natural forces are not obstructed by other natural forces when doing useful work. Man has recognised that, though natural forces follow natural laws and in accordance with those laws may be made to do useful work, yet they will not do this useful work if left to follow these natural laws in a haphazard way. Much more, then, must we recognise that the psychological machine—if I may so speak of it—will not work at haphazard, when, for every hindrance to a mechanical law, there are thousands of hindrances to a psychological one. Our force of heredity is checked every hour of the day by every influence that impresses itself on us, by every friend we meet, by every word we hear, and by every sentence we read. Equip any man with the most deeply engrained hereditary instincts and send him out into the world, and you will find that before a day is over he has been acting in defiance of his hereditary instincts. Some other force has been too much for him.

To recur to the Bramah's press. We wish it to act. What do we do ? Repair the leak and see that nothing else happens to prevent the action of the law of hydrostatics. Do we always wish

this law of heredity to work? Do we always wish a son to have his father's mental and moral qualities? Sometimes, I think, we would rather not. In that case we do our best to prevent the working of the law, just as we try to prevent the operation of the law of gravitation when we see a chimney-stalk likely to fall. If his father has been a drunkard we throw every obstacle in the boy's way. We remove temptation from him, and refrain even from mentioning the father's example. But we may wish the boy to follow his father's footsteps, to become a true, honest man like his father. In that case we remove every obstacle and keep his father's example before him. We let nothing happen to prevent the law of heredity from working, but strive to guide it into such a channel that we may employ it as a natural force to do useful work, viz., the moulding of a noble character.

We find, therefore, that heredity is an important force, but is beset with numerous difficulties in being turned to practical application. In spite of all these difficulties, have we been able to take advantage of this law in our social economy? To a certain extent we have. A boy very often chooses his father's occupation and succeeds in it; but how far this is taking advantage of hereditary aptitude is doubtful, for the boy usually chooses it because he is more familiar with this than with any other profession, and the familiarity was acquired not when he was a protoplasmic mass of possibilities, but when he was lively flesh and blood, poking his finger into every corner and bothering his father with questions about everything he saw. The fact is that we have little experience that this force of heredity does surmount its obstacles, and consequently little expectation that it will do so. This is so even where we might expect its action to be most effective—in the region of the emotions.

We constantly speak of the poet as born, not made. Now what is more likely than that a faculty which—if the old proverb be true—comes into existence in the germ, and which is not one of those excrescences put on by education like a knowledge of history or geography or jurisprudence or the like, should afford us instances of the most undisputed kind as to the action of heredity? Should we not expect all prophets to be the sons of prophets and all the sons of poets to be poets? But here, it seems, we are misled. Now and again, it seems, some mediocre poetaster begets a son with the true inspiration in him, and now and then the son of a poet will prolong the echoes of his father's song, but sink into oblivion after all, obscured by his father's greatness. The poet seems to get born in the most unlikely places, of the most unlikely parents—now of a Warwickshire burgess, now of a London scrivener, now of a profligate man about town, now of an Ayrshire ploughman, now of a Lincolnshire vicar.

We have no experience that heredity has been, and no expectation

that heredity will be, a royal road to give us poets. We do not expect it to give us our artists, our musicians, our sculptors. And yet, when we think that the emotional qualities are more likely to be transmitted than the calm and sober and oft-curbed qualities of the intellect, we might be excused for thinking that we are more likely to have hereditary sons of emotion like poets and artists, than hereditary sons of intellect like philosophers, lawyers, and statesmen. In short, if we were to be asked to apply the law in some practical way, then, guided by purely abstract reason, we should say: "We are doubtful if even this will be a success, owing to the many obstacles to the working of the law; but we might try to set up a Hereditary Academy of Poets. By no means would we advise the setting up of a Hereditary Chamber of Legislators."

But this is exactly what we have done. And this is what the Duke of Argyll has learnt from Darwin. O Darwin, what folly is written in thy name! Because there is a tendency for a son to resemble his father, the Duke concludes that every eldest son of a peer is a heaven-born legislator, not because he has studied the needs of the country, or the philosophical principles that ought to guide legislation, or the laws of political economy, but simply and solely guided by the power of some traditional maxims engrained in his protoplasm.

Let us look once more at the Duke's syllogism. It seems to amount to this:

Sons inherit their fathers' intellectual qualities.

The peers are sons.

Therefore the peers inherit their fathers' intellectual qualities.

But we must have some assurance that there were intellectual qualities to inherit, so in another syllogism we have the underlying assumption:

The qualities for which the original peers were chosen were their intellectual ones.

The qualities the descendants inherit are those for which the original peers were chosen.

Therefore the qualities which the present peers inherit are intellectual ones.

Therefore, of course, the peers are men in every way fitted to make our laws, and "it is only shallow thinking that attacks the hereditary principle."

As we have made quite plain, we have no quarrel with the hereditary principle if it be employed with due regard to its limits. What we are concerned with, is the Duke's particular application of it. We have seen that even for the major premiss of the first of the above syllogisms there is but slight foundation. We cannot assert that it is universal. The limiting conditions are so many that we can only assert that "here and there a son inherits his father's

intellectual qualities." The first syllogism falls to the ground, being contradicted by experience.

But what shall we say of the second syllogism? Can we boldly declare that every peer was created for his legislative qualities? What are the facts? Can a score of existing peers point to their ancestors created peers because they were patriotic statesmen? We need not rake up the scandalous proceedings to which many a member of the House of Lords owes his right to legislate. A number of peerages were created by that monarch who was the father of his people—at least, of a good many of them; these were bestowed on persons whose only claim was that they owed their birth, as well as their peerages, to himself. Were we to have immense faith in the power of heredity, we might trace to this circumstance another characteristic of the nobility besides their statesmanship—their notorious immorality. By means of intermarriages the royal blood will now be trickling in the veins of most of the noble families of the country, so that we might have an interesting investigation by studying Burke's *Picage* along with the annals of modern divorce courts to see how far aristocratic immorality is due to the transmitted lusts of the Merry Monarch. However that may be, we are glad to find that not all the peerages are derived from this source. Some have been given to soldiers who have led the country's armies to victory. Yet even here we fail to see the logic of assuming that their children's children will be heaven-born statesmen. As legislators, indeed, these warriors themselves have seldom been successful. Even the Duke of Wellington on moving "from casque to cushion" was about as much of a success as Coriolanus on a similar occasion. Their genius was of a military character, not a legislative. But our Constitution and the Duke of Argyll assume that the portion of the talents of these men that goes to their sons—their eldest sons, at any rate—is not the military portion but the legislative. One would have thought that if there were anything in the hereditary principle which we could put to practical use it would be that we should utilise a man's successes and not his failures. But no; heredity gives us heaven-born legislators, but not heaven born military commanders. In other words, a man's military talent is dissipated during his own lifetime; his legislative talent—even if he has none—can be portioned out and handed down from heir male of his body to heir male of his heir male's body till no more heirs male are forthcoming, or till the House of Lords has been abolished. Passing over peerages given as bribes, and peerages given as rewards for adherence to a party, and even peerages which were bought for so many pounds sterling, we find a small residue that were actually given to the original holders because they were men the State had need of to make her laws. But will this residue save Sodom?

Still another assumption underlies this misapplication of the law of heredity. Like the offspring of all vertebrates, the eldest son of a peer is not produced by fission or gemmation, but is born of two parents. What about the inherited qualities? The qualities he inherits may be those of the father or those of the mother, or they may be a blend of the two. In this last case, the child may strike an exact mean between his father's and his mother's nature, or his disposition will show the predominance of one or the other of theirs. What is the assumption of the British Constitution and the Duke of Argyll? That the child inherits the qualities of the father, or, at least, that the qualities of the father predominate in him. But when so many other things may occur, surely this is rather rash. Why, in the name of logic, is it not just as likely that the qualities of the mother will predominate? At any rate, on surveying the matter without reference to any defence of the House of Lords, we shall conclude that there is, at least, likely to be a sprinkling of qualities inherited from the mother. Now, are the mothers of peers selected for the sole reason that they are likely to bear children fitted to become legislators? Does a peer, before proposing to the daughter of some American Pork King, make her pass an examination on the principles of government? Have *all* the women who become peeresses—for in this argument we must have *all*; an exceptional case will not do—lofty views as to the country's welfare, deep knowledge as to principles of government, and noble aspirations for progress? These women, too, must hold these views not as light fancies, but deeply engrained in their minds, their whole being so set with them that they can be stamped by heredity on the young legislators they bear. Before the Duke can prove to us that he is a heaven-born legislator, he must produce his pedigree and show that the original Argyll was a man of profound statesmanship, and that every Argyll, male and female, on the list was an ardent patriot and, what is more, a wise one. If he can do this, and likewise show the same for the pedigree of every duke, marquis, earl, viscount, baron, or other titled being in the House of Lords, we shall humbly sit at the feet of the Lords, and while we learn of them how to choose our wives and stamp the noblest parts of our characters on our sons, we shall murmur "Long live the House of Lords! Perish the shallow thinkers who would destroy it! and, Long live His Grace the Duke of Argyll!"

But what are the facts? The fact that a peer sometimes marries a circus-girl or a ballet-girl is worth mentioning, but need not detain us, as the cases are comparatively rare. But in the annals of the peerage this is a common tale. A man of ability is created a peer. Now, there is a tradition in this country that, though a peer cannot pay his tailor, he must keep a footman, and he must have a butler though, like Pharaoh, he lets his baker, "go hang." The consequence is that, though the original peer may be a man of more ability than

wealth, and a man of more sense than to seek to make a display of wealth when he has none, his son is usually anxious to combine the new peerage with the traditional display, and most naturally wants some money to do it with. Now, the counterpart is ready in the person of some heiress who has the money and would like the title. She may be a lady of great intellectual power, but that is an extra. Her money is her main attraction. Now, what is an heiress? Presumably a lady who has no brothers, and who is most frequently an only daughter. If she is an only daughter, this fact shows that she comes of an unprolific race, for this is a field that heredity works in. The consequence is that, with the second or with the third peer, the peerage becomes extinct from lack of issue. On this very point Mr. Francis Galton, who can hardly be called a shallow thinker, writes: "Although many men of eminent ability have not left descendants behind them, it is not because they are sterile, but because they are apt to marry sterile women in order to obtain wealth in order to support the peerages with which their merits have been rewarded. *I look upon the peerage as a disastrous institution, owing to its destructive effects on our valuable races.* The most highly gifted men are ennobled, their eldest sons are tempted to marry heiresses, and their younger sons not to marry at all, for they have not enough fortune to support both a family and an aristocratic position. So the side-shoots of the genealogical tree are hacked off, and the leading shoot is blighted, and the breed is lost for ever."

And passing from the fathers and mothers, what about the sons themselves? Can any one in his senses, and considering what an important and sacred duty the making of a law is, say that heredity alone will equip a man for it? Surely as much education is needed for this as for the curing of a fever, the setting of a bone, or the deciding whether a man is honestly or fraudulently bankrupt. We educate our physicians and surgeons, we educate and train the judges who administer our laws, but for the making of these laws we keep a houseful of men who are supposed to have picked up the art somehow or other. Oh, the marvels of the British Constitution! Strange men sometimes get into the House of Commons, men of little culture, who know little of history or sociology or jurisprudence or political economy, but every one of these has undergone an important part of a political education—the hustings. There their crude ideas have been systematised, and while they may be cloudy and unpracticable still, there is this to be said about them, that they have met with the sympathy of some of those whom legislation is intended to benefit. But if strange men sometimes achieve the right to enter the House of Commons, surely stranger men have the right to sit in the House of Lords; men who all their lives have treated serious study as a bore, who know nothing of history, who despise sociology, and talk about horses when you mention jurisprudence, or

change the subject of political economy into a conversation on dogs. They have not even undergone the chastening of the hustings; and yet one of these duffers has 50,000 times as much voice in the making of a law as Herbert Spencer or John Ruskin. Surely it is sometimes the salvation of the country that men like these think the House of Lords "a dull old hole" and attendance there a bore.

The Duke refers to one or two cases where in his opinion the House of Lords was more representative of the nation than the House of Commons. Admitting, for the sake of avoiding a long digression in the argument, that it was so, we ask, Is this a reason for maintaining such an institution? Has the Duke never heard of the hundreds of cases where the House of Lords has been less representative of the nation than the House of Commons? Has he never heard of the cases where it has even defied the feeling of the nation? "Can you doubt the power of Neptune?" said a believer; "look at the offerings of the sailors who prayed to him in the storm and were saved." "Ah!" said the sceptic, "where are the offerings of those who prayed to him and were drowned?" Is it not written in the chronicles of every great reform that year after year it was rejected by the House of Lords? Is there any credit in delaying reforms? Are we moving so rapidly towards a perfect state that we can afford to keep an institution to check our progress at every step? And when we think that this institution is a set of men who, if they have any real legislative genius, possess it merely as an accidental attribute, and legislate because they are descended from some bloodthirsty legionary of the Conqueror's or from Nell Gwynn or some such distinguished ancestress, we are amazed at the folly of a country that has borne it so long. Would an employer keep a man to stand at the door of his workshop and, whenever an order was going out, allow him to give it a blow with a hammer to render it useless or to delay it for some other time? We cannot imagine a Trades Union so silly as to order a strike if such a man were ignominiously dismissed.

We do not object to have our legislation revised. If there is anything obscure or foolish in an Act of Parliament, let us have it revised by all means before it become law. By so doing we shall be doing an immense service to the country in preventing litigation and trouble arising from legal obscurities. But the revisers must be competent men. The great complaint about legislation is that, when it issues from the House of Commons, it is tinged with party bias. Is this cured by sending it through the House of Lords? Unfortunately the hereditary principle that guides the peers is this: "If the Liberal party have set their hearts on a reform, it is our duty to reject it." Nor will this be remedied as long as hereditary legislators sit in the House of Lords. For the one sure way to

make a man indolent is to tell him he will attain something without his striving for it, and the one sure way to have indolent politicians is to have a breed of hereditary legislators, and the only principle that guides an indolent politician is, "Vote with your party." How the House of Lords is to rid us of party bias in legislation we fail to see.

Surely the hereditary principle is worth the Duke's reconsideration. Is he so convinced of its force that he would maintain a hereditary piper at Inverary or entrust the management of his estates to a hereditary factor? If not, let him consider whether the people of this country are not justified in refusing any longer to entrust the management of their estate—their liberty and happiness—to a number of men whose only qualification is their birth, and who may or may not be unselfish in the discharge of their trust. If, when he and his fellow-aristocrats request to be permitted to legislate for them, he finds the people of this country inclined to reply, "No, thank you," let him seek to establish the reasonableness of the request in some other way than by backing up a mediæval superstition with the results of nineteenth century science.

ROBERT MURISON, M.A.

STEWART CLARK.

“AN example of energy, patience, good judgment, and daring courage scarcely equalled by any one, even in those times when so many bright examples were forthcoming.”

These words refer to the period of the Indian Mutiny; they were written by the Special Commissioner of Allygurh and Mynpoorie; they were applied to the late Stewart Clark, who died on March 25, 1897, and of whom a too brief memoir has lately appeared.¹ Stewart Clark was born in 1814 at Crathie, then an out-of-the-way village, but well enough known since Balmoral Castle was built just by. In the neighbourhood young Clark passed his boyhood and his college vacations. He roamed the mountains and valleys with line and gun as he pleased, for most of the preserves were open to him, and what has since become the Queen's Highland domain was then as it were a part of his playground. His father was a mechanical genius and inventor, one of his uncles an architect, and from these his alert intellect picked up information which served him well on various occasions in his Indian career. In due time he passed to Aberdeen University, then to St. Thomas's Hospital, London. He was admitted a member of the College of Surgeons in 1834, and soon after took service in the famous ships of Richard Green, whose friend and trusted adviser he became. In 1850 he entered the service of the East India Company as assistant surgeon, and thus began the most important work of his life. It was the custom of John Company to utilise the knowledge of his medical officers in various civil employments, and a man of Stewart Clark's acquirements was speedily relegated to such work in the North-West Provinces. Thus when the Mutiny broke out he was Inspector of Prisons as well as Dispensaries, in charge of military hospitals and troops in garrison, superintendent of the great Government workshops, at Allygurh, where the mail carts were made and other works carried out. Here he had from 1200 to 1300 native workmen employed; and it says much for his influence that after the troubles

¹ *Stewart Clark: One of Nature's Noblemen.* By S. E. S. C. London: Baillière, Tindall & Cox. 1898.

were over most of them returned to work under him in re-establishing the factory which had been destroyed.

This work was one of the highest importance to the Government and the military, for the rapid conveyance of troops was thus provided for. The Indian Secretary subsequently stated that "in spite of surrounding difficulties he never failed to meet every demand."

The extreme value of his services in those trying times may be stated in terms of official despatches.

"Dr. Clark's operations have been conducted within reach of the enemy. The workshops are full two miles from the fort. They were plundered, burnt, and destroyed by the enemy, the operatives dispersed, and the numerous public vehicles reduced to an occasional stray cart or waggon and fragments of others.

"When postal and passenger communication was renewed, it was accepted as a matter of course, but the public and perhaps the Government little know how largely they were indebted to the unobtrusive courage, system, and resources of this valuable officer."

The Secretary of the Government of the North-Western Provinces wrote that when the whole country rose and the Europeans were driven into the fort, Clark's system of transmitting minute despatches was the only successful endeavour to communicate with Delhi and Cawnpore. He testifies too to the vital importance of rapid transport of troops effected by Clark, and the value of his plan of rapidly seasoning wood at that most critical period.

The Commissioner first cited mentions seeing Dr. Clark on two or three occasions engaged in single combat with rebels, and in another despatch tells how, being attacked with ten other civilians at dinner, these eleven rode out and charged into a mass of the enemy, from which none expected to return alive. The Commissioner, who was himself one of the eleven thus entrapped, in his report (October 5, 1858) thus describes the fight: "Scarcely a word was spoken, but each seemed to understand his neighbour's thoughts, saddled his horse and drew his sword. We rode forth, the gallant Watson (civil magistrate) at our head. On reaching the road we were met by a salute from a hundred matchlocks; a hundred more were aimed, but missed fire owing to the damp state of the atmosphere. 'Charge' was the order, and well it was obeyed. Stirrup to stirrup and man to man, we dashed through the mass of cowards, scattering them like so many sheep, and not stopping till some fifteen corpses remained as trophies of our victory. Watson was wounded, as was his horse, and two or three got contusions.

"When we charged, I believe no one expected to come back alive;

and when darkness compelled our return, it was with feelings of intense satisfaction and thankfulness that we finished our repast, and talked over our escapes and adventures."

It was after some such encounter as this, but with military as well as civilians, that on looking round at the conclusion of the combat, the officer, seeing Stewart Clark, exclaimed, "What business have you here? What should we have done if we were all wounded or if you had been killed?"

After the anxieties and perils of the Mutiny it is no wonder that Stewart Clark's health failed, and in 1863 he was obliged to come home on sick leave. All this time, it will be observed, his talents had been utilised in more important services than the duties of a regimental surgeon. But the India Office had framed a retrospective rule that no assistant surgeon should be promoted unless he had discharged these lesser duties through two years. Many other doctors were involved in this unjust regulation, but their protests were futile. Stewart Clark then took up the protest, became their leader, and was obliged to overcome his natural modesty and present his own claim to recognition. It was too strong to be resisted, and the India Office had to give way—the rule was not to be retrospective.

Besides the offices already mentioned, Stewart Clark was called upon to fill that of Postmaster-General of the North-West Provinces, and well was it for the nation that this was the case, for the forwarding of despatches, troops, and munitions was a condition essential to the suppression of the Mutiny. To his ingenuity the Government and the military were indebted for the transmission of information in minute secret letters, carried by men who ran the most desperate risks to serve him. When the factories were destroyed all the seasoned wood in store was burned, and none could be obtained. Again it was Dr. Clark's ingenuity and zeal that devised and carried out a mode of drying green wood in the course of hours instead of months, and so he managed, in the face of unexampled difficulties, to re-establish the mail service and forward the troops.

When it became known that such priceless services would only serve to prevent his promotion in due course in the medical service, representations were sent to the India House on the part of the Secretaries of the Indian Governments, of Lieutenant-Governors and Governors, and of the Governor-General himself, and, as already stated, Stewart Clark's case was won, and with it that of the other officers.

The Government of the North-West Provinces wrote that "Dr. Clark's failure to comply with the conditions is due to no act of his own, but to those whom Government had set over him," and the Lieutenant-Governor "has the sincerest pleasure in certify-

ing that he is one of the most zealous, able, conscientious officers connected with the administration over which he has the honour to preside."

The Commissioners of Finance and Supplies went so far as to "bring to the notice of the Government that his salary of 350 rupees is but poor consolation for so large a trust and services so important."

The Secretary of the North-West Provinces wrote: "I am to add on the part of this Government that it would have been most detrimental to the public interests to have allowed Dr. Clark to abdicate his present office."

The Lieutenant-Governor wrote that indulgence as to the regulation on promotion "would be but a small return for the very valuable services rendered by Dr. Clark during the disturbances, and the importance of which has been acknowledged by the Government of India and by her Majesty's Government."

The foregoing will suffice to show how Stewart Clark's services were appreciated by those who had the opportunity of judging of their value. He received the thanks of the Governor-General and of the Government of India, as well as of the Queen, for his services during the Mutiny. Yes, thanks from every quarter, through all ranks up to the throne. What then? To many it may come as a surprise that nothing followed. To some extent this was due to the death of Lord Canning, who was heard to declare that on his return he would see that Clark should be well rewarded for his unique services. Was it also in any degree due to his successful resistance of the retrospective regulation? Mutinies may come and empires may be shaken, but Red Tape remains, and its slaves remember to retaliate on all who defy her decrees. Then, after all, Clark belonged to the medical department of the army, which has been neglected or unjustly treated by successive Governments, until the public service suffers from a dearth of doctors. Only last month the Government had to confess in Parliament that the army service is practically boycotted by the medical profession. No wonder when the Commander-in-Chief has been permitted to insult that profession, and the War Minister has not had the courage to rebuke him. Let that Minister insist on absolute justice to medical officers, and read a lesson on manners to the Horse Guards, and the reluctance of doctors for the service will disappear.

Stewart Clark returned to India and served until 1872. Then his health, which had never recovered from the great strain of the Mutiny, compelled him to retire. He had then attained the rank of Surgeon-Major, but he never used the title, preferring to be known as plain Mr. Stewart Clark.

Those who only knew him after his retirement, when the wear

and tear of life had left its mark on his constitution, will retain a vivid recollection of his courtesy, geniality, and diversified talents. Art, literature, science counted for much with him. He had always been a musician; he painted both in oils and water-colours, and possessed many other accomplishments, which made him an amusing as well as an intellectual companion.

“THE STATE CHURCH”

AND THE TROUBLES OF HER CLERGY.

“IS SHE OUT OF TOUCH WITH THE AGE?”

A LONG and acrimonious discussion has been engaging the mind of the public for some time, between the clergy of the Established Church on the one hand and the laity on the other, as to what they (the clergy) describe as the totally inadequate value which they receive for their services. These (the clergy) contend with much bitterness of spirit that the salary which they are in receipt of is not only quite insufficient for their *own* wants, but is also totally inadequate for the support and bringing up of their “alas! too often numerous families as well”; and ask how they can be reasonably expected to *live* on the pay they receive from the State in even the most moderate comfort, and enabled at the same time to educate their children in a manner befitting their station, holding that the large sum spent on their own education alone should fairly entitle them to a more remunerative salary, and qualifying their demand for increased pay on the ground that “*The labourer is worthy of his hire.*”

Very interesting and instructive will it be to look a little closer into this matter, and judge for ourselves whether the cry is a worthy one and deserving of the attention it demands.

That the honest labourer is worthy of his hire we are all agreed on, and so abundantly is this proved in *fact* amongst dissenting ministers of the Church, and also among the Roman Catholic priesthood, that seldom, if ever, do we hear complaint or murmur from these with regard to their pay and emoluments.

Why then, we are led to ask, is it that only amongst the State-paid clergy of the land do we have this ever-present and somewhat undignified begging for a *mere living wage*?

Let us see what their own supporters have to say on the subject, and whether this importunate cry of theirs for more pay commends itself to those whom they profess and are paid to teach as a worthy cry.

Do *they* consider, in this particular case, that the labourer is worthy of more hire, and therefore entitled to a larger wage?

That the Clergy of the Established Church are in the main a hard-working body of men can hardly be denied, yet, curious though it may seem, it often happens that the hardest worked of them all is the worst paid of them all; and therefore we shall expect to find some very good reasons given for such general and almost universal apathy on the part of their own patrons.

Some of these excuse themselves on the ground that in their opinion a general readjustment and equalisation of the pay of the whole body of clergy is necessary, and that a movement for the proper effectment of this should first come *from within the Church herself*. These persons hold that the Church, though possibly suffering from poverty in parts, is, *on the whole*, a wealthy Church, and well able to look to the needs of her poorer ministers herself. *Others* openly express the belief that this cry for increased pay is an *unworthy one*, and, while agreeing on the necessity for the State to provide for a *religate* clergy, yet, on the other hand, tell us that they do not feel inclined or justified in asking the State to provide for such a large drain on their resources as the maintenance of the numerous *progeny* of her servants would entail. And these persons are for the most part all in agreement that the enormous salaries paid to the numerous bishops of the land might, with more justice and profit, be divided amongst the whole body of the clergy in equal shares, believing that in such a course only is to be found the true remedy for the amelioration of the grievances of which the poorer members complain. And, indeed, these people would appear to have no small show of reason for this belief; for is it not a somewhat inconsistent and unjustifiable arrangement which gives to some few members of the Church their thousands (aye, and in some cases their tens of thousands per annum), whilst doling out to others a sum which is hardly sufficient to enable them to keep a decent black coat on their backs and their families outside the poor-house?

Then again, *others* tell us that, although they believe in the alliance between Church and State, yet they feel bound to refuse any practical sympathy, because they very reasonably object to the changes introduced into the services of the Church by an ever-increasing number of the so-called "High Church" clergy, who appear to be Roman Catholics in everything but the name.

And here again, is there not more than sufficient reason for their objections on this head? For so great a scandal have these practices raised in the Church herself, that only in April last a body of memorialists, 36,876 in number, presented a petition to her Majesty the Queen, praying "*that she would be pleased to take order for the repression of changes at variance with the formularies and doctrines of the Established Church, due (they said) to bishops, who neither repressed false teaching themselves, nor suffered the law to be set in motion by others.*" These memorialists further especially prayed her Majesty

"for the repression of efforts now being made to restore the Sacrifice of the Mass," and to "revive the Confessional"—(which practices, said they, "were borrowed from the Church of Rome, and from which heresies the Church of England was haply delivered at the Reformation.")

Thus, then, in a nutshell we have a few of the more prominent and cogent reasons given by *their own supporters* to justify their extreme apathy on this subject.

But what say the great body of people who do *not* support this connection between Church and State, being of opinion that no religion can be anything but a worldly one (and therefore not worthy of support) whilst hampered and restricted by the State, to whose apron-strings it has been tied?

These people, *on their side*, hold that this cry of the clergy for more pay is but part and parcel of the *fallacy* of the whole system, which is inseparable from a State-paid Church. They believe that the Established Church, as originally constituted, was "an honourable endeavour by the State to cripple the power of Rome and her heresies," and, though they give full credit and all honour to the Church for having so successfully carried out her mission, yet now they no longer see any necessity for the protection of the State against a danger that no longer exists in reality, and they believe that any further patronage by the State of *any one particular sect* of the Protestant religion, as against any other sect, is not only a *gross injustice*, but is at the same time vitally opposed to the interests of a true religion, by forcing the Church, as it does, to attempt the task of trying to serve two masters—viz., God and Mammon—which thing is impossible, and which connection, therefore, can only have the effect of making the Church "of the Earth, earthy."

And again, so long as any Church is governed by a body of *men* (however well these may be fitted for the task), and so long as the Church acknowledges (as she does in the Book of Common Prayer) an *earthly Monarch* as her head, so long will she remain in this condition, and so long will she be (in the words of a graphic writer) "*a huge preaching concern, which supports a great company of persons, who by this business have their wealth.*" Once loosed, however, from the trammels of the State apron-strings, she will gradually cast off her worldly wrappings, and retain that only which is best in her and truest.

But nothing short of the *entire casting away* once and for ever of this yoke can avail her anything. This once accomplished, the worldly advantages and "social status" which the State connection gives her, and which induces so many to enter her service, will cease to exist; and we shall then find those who wish to enter her ministry doing so *free from all suspicion* of doing it from ought but whole-hearted motives, and from which they can never be

entirely free so long as the alliance between State and Church exists.

One, it may be, finds in her service a ready means for social betterment, regarding it as an easy and respectable way of making a decent living; while others may see in her an easy way of gaining power over people's consciences. Others, again, may cast a longing glance in prospectus on a future bishopric with several thousands per annum and a seat in the House of Lords.

Then again, in these days of general enlightenment, when the most characteristic sign of the times is a *universal seeking after the truth for its own sake, as it is in fact* (and not as it was supposed to be in the imaginations of our ancestors), and in days when men prefer to think for themselves in matters that so vitally affect their future happiness, is it not an odious thing that any body of clergy should be *compelled* to teach mediæval doctrines and creeds which they themselves have (or most of them have) long ceased to believe in implicitly—things which at the best were never intended to be more than a *compromise* between the errors and contentions of the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches?

But once free her from this worldly alliance with the State, and it becomes possible for the clergy to cease preaching about dogmas and antiquated creeds, which few believe in and all question; and turn their attention and energies to spread and teach the *highest Moral Truths*, about which they are all agreed on.

Then, too, instead of prating so much about a future Heaven of which they know so little, they might direct their energies towards the betterment of the many social evils which exist all around them, and to the many Hells which exist on our earth already, and to the stamping out of all Falsehood and Injustice, Superstition and Ignorance in high places as well as amongst the humbler members of society, and about which they are all so *strangely silent*. This can never be done by squabbling and fighting about the veracity of certain antiquated doctrines, or the right and wrong way of performing certain fantastic Rites and pompous Ceremonies. For God is neither a leader of any particular church, nor is He the champion of any particular sect or creed. Then, too, perhaps, instead of consigning to eternal damnation those who are unable to accept the doctrine of the Trinity in exactly the same way as they themselves do (or are obliged to do by the Rubrics), and instead of impressing on us so forcibly the importance of believing in the "Apostolic Succession" or the "Laying on of Hands"; instead of all this they might begin to tell us a few plain truths, and how the Old Testament plainly speaks to us of the *superiority of a good life* over the right way of performing fantastic rites and ceremonies, and taking for their texts some such as the following: "To obey is better than Sacrifice," "Bring no more vain oblations, Incense is an abomination to Me," or "Thou

delightest not in vain Offerings," &c., and here they might explain that the fact of being a so-called "good Churchman," and attending so many services per Sunday avails *nothing*, and can never take the place of sincerity and righteousness of living. And is it not a terrible thing how this mania for Creeds and Dogmas and *elaborate Church Services* has taken such hold of the religion of the fashionable world? Men and women find it so much easier and pleasanter to try and serve God by "orthodoxy" and by *set fixed rules and regulations and a stated number of services on Sundays*; for does it not save them all further thought and trouble and (as they believe) permit them to run riot for the remaining six days of the week and follow their own sweet wills; (and how the Established Church encourages and fosters this idea we all well know).

So then, what are the conclusions that we must fain draw concerning this whole matter? Briefly these.

That doling out a few extra pounds per annum to the poorer members of an established clergy will help neither us nor them.

But we are forced to the conclusion that what this Age really requires is a *totally different kind of church* than a State-paid and Established Church can ever give us. This Age wants a Church whose members do not claim any special Apostolic Succession and who will lay less stress on the importance of observing fasts and ceremonies than they do on the living a Christian life, and who will place *Truth* before *Dogma* and *Facts* before *Creeds*, and who will boldly tell their hearers that a *real* religion and not a *sham* religion, religion and not religionism, is what this Age stands so sadly in need of. We want men, too, who believe and will tell others, that if Christ had meant either them or us to belong to a *Church of Bishops* He would have told us so plainly, whereas, on the only occasion on which the Disciples spoke to him in favour of an exclusive sect, His reply was short and very much to the point, "He that is not *against* us is *for* us," thus plainly showing that the matter of Church government was of no importance whatsoever in His eyes in comparison with the heart being on His side, nor is it of the smallest consequence what sect or church we may belong to.

Again we want men who will not be afraid to speak against the huge "Social Evils" and "Moral Chaos" which exist in our midst. Men in fact who are *manly* enough to *think for themselves* and who are not and never can be satisfied in accepting strange dogmas and creeds as the only road to salvation (simply because their ancestors believed in them before them). Men, too, we want who will proclaim boldly that the selfish enjoyment of churches and chapels and elaborate services is as nothing compared to the noble effort made to elevate the struggling masses of human Wretchedness, and the efforts made to cultivate a large-hearted Charity to the extinction of all

Pharisaism with its accompaniments of envy, malice, and all uncharitableness.

Such men (all honour to them) do exist as a wholesome leaven in the Established Church to-day, but only in a minority, and these are sadly hampered by this worldly connection with the State.

This *new order of Clergy* will preach and teach the *pure unadulterated Gospel of Christ*, which He preached for all time and to all churches on the shores of Genesareth ; and by their whole lives will endeavour to show their *contempt for gold* and do all in their power to bring about the *Brotherhood of Man* which is the Kingdom of God on this Earth.

DUDLEY S. A. COSBY.

PROTECTIVE CHARACTERS AND NATURAL SELECTION.

PROTECTIVE characters have proved an attractive field of investigation to the modern zoologist. The idea that such characters have arisen—like the courage which “mounteth with occasion”—in response to the need thereof, is a fascinating one. Thus a species of animal exposed to the attacks of many enemies is in danger of extermination. But *natural selection steps in*—to put it in the usual picturesque but illogical phraseology—and throws a protecting mantle over it: it becomes clothed in protective characters. Thus nature, “red in tooth and claw” towards the INDIVIDUAL, becomes, *in consequence*, an *alma mater* to the SPECIES. The idea is, indeed, a fascinating one; the sword which threatens to destroy is changed by *its own action* into a protecting shield. And then the—*sometimes misleading*—argument from analogy is not wanting. For do we not see the bird rising in the air *by means* of the *opposing* current; the muscle growing *stronger* with the *exercise* which *wastes* it; and the tree becoming more *firmly rooted* in response to the wind which *tends to overthrow it*?

There is, then, some excuse for the great band of enthusiastic naturalists who, carried away by the fascination of the idea, have flooded biological literature with their explanations of how *protective characters* have been developed.

What, then, are protective characters? In looking round the animal kingdom we see, for example, that many of the animals living among the snows of Greenland are white, while those living in desert regions are often of a sandy hue; in other cases we see animals armed with offensive weapons, as the stings of insects; or we see certain families of animals *resembling* certain others, which latter are for some reason or other supposed to be free from the attacks of the usual enemies—as in the so-called *mimicry* among butterflies and other insects. Among plants, again, we see some provided with spines, thorns, stings or bristles. All these are examples of *protective characters*.

In the following remarks it is intended to inquire whether such characters can logically be supposed to owe their evolution to the Darwinian principles of natural selection.

In the first place, then, while in many cases these characters are of protective value, in others they are very doubtfully so, or even obviously otherwise.

This would appear to be the case as regards the *whiteness* of certain polar animals. The following extracts from *In Arctic Seas*, or the *Voyage of the Kite*, refer to the Polar bear :

"The fur was very thick, long, and of a yellowish-white colour, in marked contrast to the pure whiteness of the snow" (p. 107).

"A she-bear and her two cubs were seen at a considerable distance from the ship, their yellowish fur making them clearly distinguishable against the icy background" (p. 108).

As further examples, let us take the lemming and the musk ox. In summer the former is described as of a *yellowish-brown*, and in winter as of a *greyish-white*. The musk ox has long *dark brown* hair, with fine *yellow* fur beneath. There is, moreover, evidence to show that the white colour is partly due to the direct action of the cold.

Among insects, protective characters are extremely common, and may in many cases serve to protect them from insect-eating animals and other enemies. But if it be admitted that they have a certain protective value, it must also be insisted that this has been greatly exaggerated by those who trace their origin to the action of natural selection. Many of the examples brought forward, indeed, are too far-fetched and fanciful to be seriously considered. And even admitting the full protective value claimed for such characters, it would still be a far cry to the possibility of their evolution by natural selection. When the attempt is made to trace in detail the development of the protective characters of any particular species many difficulties are met with. Such a protected species is supposed to have arisen from one freely devoured by insectivorous animals, and by reason of being so persecuted. Among the individuals of such a species—let us suppose they were caterpillars—some would be a little more like their surroundings than the rest. The question is, would the keen-sighted insect-eater fail to detect them because of their *slightly* greater resemblance to their surroundings? Are there any grounds for supposing that those *left* by the birds would not contain a *large majority* of the normal type? And, if this were so, the few individuals a little more like their surroundings than the normal type would have their variations swamped by inter-crossing, even if *none* of them were eaten. But that they would escape being eaten, under the supposed circumstances, seems unlikely. Under normal conditions insects are so prolific that even those species most devoured by birds, &c., remain sufficiently abundant to continue the species. But the evolution of a new "protected" species is supposed to have arisen from a time of *special* persecution: individuals were so eagerly sought after by their enemies that *only* those escaped

which were *slightly more like* their surroundings than the rest. We must suppose that individual A, which was normal, was devoured, while B, which was feeding in close proximity, escaped *because* it was *slightly more like* its surroundings. It must be remembered that birds feeding on caterpillars are in the habit of coming to the bushes where they are wont to find them, and searching at pretty close quarters. How, then, can a *slight* difference in individual caterpillars be supposed to deceive them? But the caterpillars have other enemies besides birds, and these can scarcely be supposed, even by the most enthusiastic, to be discriminators of minute individual differences. These enemies are ichneumon flies. Professor Poulton found that out of 533 larvæ collected by him, no less than 422, or about four out of five, died from the presence of ichneumon grubs. Now it can scarcely be supposed that the *one* of the five which survived did so by reason of any slight individual peculiarity by which it differed from the other four, or by anything but what we usually call *chance*.

It seems a fallacy, indeed, to suppose that a hard-pressed race will tend by reason of the persecution to form a new one by the survival of *slight variations*. Pressed themselves by hunger, the persecuting race will not be able to respect slight differences—they will be forced to search so diligently that a *slight* resemblance to their surroundings will not avail the insects. Those which do escape will owe their safety to chance, rather than to slight individual differences. And none of the species which have been hard pressed in recent times have, as far as we know, formed new species. The much persecuted bison and rhea of America do not seem to be doing so. The extinct dodo and sea-cow have not left new races behind them. Possibly, however, where human agency comes in, the case may be considered different. But there is also the case of the rat. The brown rat has persecuted and almost exterminated the black rat, yet the latter has not developed a new species. On the island of St. Helena, again, the goat is said to have practically exterminated the trees and shrubs by its depredations. Yet no *new species* of plants has been thereby produced, although the peculiarities of certain existing species are attributed to similar depredations by cattle in the far past.

When we consider the case of what are called *warning* colours in insects the difficulty seems even greater. A species of insect is much eaten by birds, and among its spontaneous variations some show more brilliant and conspicuous colours than the rest. This colour is supposed to be arranged so that in the course of further development it will resemble that of a species which birds for some reason avoid. Can we reasonably suppose that a bird will be deceived by the *beginning* of such a resemblance, especially when hard pressed by hunger? The varying insect must at first be far more like the *normal* members of its own species, which are *freely eaten*, than

like those of the other species, which is *avoided*. And if the bird is not deceived by the beginning of the resemblance, this will not be further developed, but will be swamped by inter-crossing. It is, perhaps, doubtful whether the most perfect example of mimicry known to naturalists can deceive the keen eye of the insect-eating bird; it is *quite certain* that the *beginning* of such a resemblance cannot do so. These considerations show that Mr. Bates's explanation of mimicry, though generally received, is insufficient. The case of insects protected by nauseous or poisonous qualities is equally difficult. There can be no doubt here as to the protection—at any rate, as far as concerns the latter quality—but how has it been developed? According to the principles of natural selection the property must have been acquired gradually. But even if individuals suddenly appeared perfectly poisonous, or exceedingly nauseous, the difficulty remains. A bird might eat a poisonous insect and die, or a highly nauseous one and avoid the whole species in future; in neither case would anything have been done towards the evolution of a poisonous or nauseous species. For the poisonous insect is *killed* as well as the bird; and the sickened bird would avoid in future the perfectly wholesome and normal insects. Again, let us suppose that the acquisition of poisonous or nauseous qualities was gradual. Insect-eating animals are probably, as a rule, not very sensitive in the matter of taste; but, supposing one of them were to get an insect of not quite so good a flavour as usual, what would be the effect? There would be nothing to distinguish the nauseous insect from the rest—nothing, at least, so striking as to enable the bird to notice and remember. It would have learned nothing to enable it to distinguish and avoid other nauseous individuals. Either it must now avoid the species entirely, or go on eating as usual, and take its chance of getting a nauseous mouthful occasionally. *In neither case would it assist in the evolution of nauseous characters.* And we must remember that the nauseous or poisonous quality was at first something very little different from the normal wholesomeness, and would therefore *very* slightly affect the insect-eater. We must, moreover, be careful in our assumptions as to the protective value of nauseous, or even poisonous, qualities. That “one man’s meat is another’s poison” has probably its application here, and the avoidance of nauseous insects has only been proved for a few species of insect-eaters. In any case, the fact that such nauseous species are not increasing greatly in numbers almost necessitates the assumption that they are freely eaten by something; *possibly* on account of the very property which renders them “*caviare* to the general.”

Professor Poulton has pointed out in certain caterpillars what he calls a “terrifying attitude.” Thus the caterpillar of the *Puss moth* has certain markings which give it the appearance of a caricature of

a vertebrate face, and when threatened with danger it presents these markings to its foes. This is supposed to be a protective character, and "*probably alarming to its vertebrate foes.*" By means of careful experiments Professor Poulton has shown that lizards and marmosets are, *to a certain extent, alarmed* by the appearance of such caterpillars. They approach them with caution, and examine them carefully before eating them. But they *do eat them*. If, then, the fully developed "*terrifying attitude*" does not save the caterpillar from animals, which are, perhaps, not in the habit of seeing that particular species, how can we suppose that the animals which fed on the ancestral form of the same were deterred from eating those in which the *germs* of the *terrifying attitude* first appeared? The entire experimental evidence, indeed, on which the assumption that warning colours and terrifying attitudes confer immunity is based is eminently unsatisfactory. This is shown by an examination of Professor Poulton's experiments.¹ The general result of these experiments was that the insect with the warning colour, or the terrifying attitude, was received at *first with suspicion*, but finally *eaten*. Obviously it reaped no benefit from its colours or attitude. Yet, strangely enough, Professor Poulton considers his experimental evidence confirmatory of his theory.

Among our most notable native examples of mimicry are certain bee-like and wasp-like flies. Their resemblance to bees and wasps is supposed to be of protective value, and to confer immunity from insect-eating animals. In the usual phraseology, for a long series of generations in the past, only those individuals survived which were increasingly like bees. And they survived because their enemies avoided them on account of this resemblance. Two points require to be noted here: first, how far the resemblance can be supposed to deceive the interested individuals; and second, how far true bees and wasps are avoided by insectivorous animals.

The resemblance of the flies in question to bees and wasps is doubtless very striking.

Even such a skilled and experienced naturalist as Réaumur tells us, in his *Memoirs* on certain of these flies, that he hesitated to take them in his hand on account of their likeness to bees. But a little familiarity soon enables one to detect the deception readily enough. Such, at least, is my experience. I have been in the habit of observing bees pretty closely for a number of years, and can easily detect the sham at a few yards' distance. Mr. Bates had a similar experience with the humming-bird hawk-moth. "*Several times,*" he says, "*I shot by mistake a humming-bird hawk-moth instead of a bird. This moth (*Macroglossa Titan*) is somewhat smaller than humming-birds generally are, but its manner of flight, and the way it poises itself before a flower whilst probing it with its proboscis, are*

¹ *Colours of Animals*, pp. 247, 261, 280, &c.

precisely like the same actions of humming-birds. It was only after many days' experience that I learnt to distinguish one from another when on the wing."¹

Seeing, then, that the human eye may be trained to detect the difference readily, may we not infer that the keen and practised eye of an insect-eater, which depends for its existence on its powers of sight, will as readily learn to recognise the 'sham? Réaumur's experience, indeed, was different, for even after long practice he could not easily detect the bee-like fly at first sight. But, then, even a Réaumur can scarcely be supposed to have the trained eye of an insectivorous bird, or the same keen interest in judging which might be eaten. It seems, then, that the sham insect should be readily recognised by its enemies.

The second point is, do birds and other insect-eaters *avoid* bees and wasps as food? The answer is, They are *rather partial* to them than otherwise. Thus, a writer in the *Naturalist* (November 1889) relates how a wasps' nest, having been discovered and exposed in front, was in a few days completely destroyed by great tits, *both wasps and grubs being devoured*. Toads, again, have been observed to feed willingly on both bees and wasps. The blue tit, the great tit, the fly-catcher, the chaffinch, and the sparrow are noted by bee-keepers as devourers of their stock. Virgil, it is well known, accuses the swallow. And yet Dr. Wallace² observes of a certain wasp-like beetle that its disguise had no doubt often saved it "from the beak of hungry birds!" Nor does the sting of the bee or wasp save it from some of the larger spiders.

Certain birds, again, have been observed to extract the stings before eating the insects. The bear philosophically takes the stings along with the honey.

Thus, on the one hand, the resemblance is probably insufficient to deceive; and, on the other hand, if it were perfect it would not save the flies, since their enemies do not avoid either bees or wasps. And if this is so, it is scarcely worth while to go back to the time when the resemblance was, so to speak, in its infancy, and say that individual flies a *little* more like bees than the rest would not on that account escape.

But there is another view as to the meaning of this resemblance of certain species of flies to bees. Some of them are parasitic on bees—that is, they lay their eggs in the bees' nests—and it has been observed that they resemble the particular species in whose nests they thus place their eggs. This resemblance is supposed to protect them from the bees, which take them for their own kind. If this likeness is thus supposed to be the result of the protection afforded by deceiving the bee, we must believe something of this sort to have taken place:

¹ *The Naturalist on the Amazon*, p. 187.

² *Natural Selection*, p. 96.

A race of flies, not like bees, took to laying their eggs in bees' nests. Presently the bees, in revenge, began to kill the flies. But among the numerous spontaneous variations occurring among the flies were some *remotely like* bees. The bees were taken in by this *distant resemblance*, and did not kill these flies. In every succeeding generation those flies which were most like bees survived most frequently, while the others were killed by the bees. It is difficult to understand how the *slight resemblance* in its initial stages could deceive the bees. Even with the perfected resemblance of the present day there is a suspicion that, if it cannot deceive a practised observer at a few yards, neither can it deceive a bee at a few inches. And if such an explanation—the killing off of all flies not sufficiently like bees—is correct, it ought to be shown that bees at the present day *do kill* the flies hovering round their nests. Indeed, to keep the mimicking flies up to the mark of their present attainments, it should be shown that all showing retrogression—and there ought to be such—are killed off by the bees. If this were not so, then, according to the principle of panmixia, there should be degeneration back to the normal type.

A notable special objection which has been urged against the general theory of protective resemblances is that "protected" species are usually rare. And it is a remarkable fact that in certain families a species protected by mimicry may be *rare*, while others of the normal family type and inhabiting the same country are *common*. Among the butterflies of the family *Pieridae*, for example, certain species which mimic *Papilionidae* are scarce, while normal species of the same family are common. Now, it seems a reasonable supposition that a specially protected species should be able to multiply and become more numerous than an unprotected one. In fact, to fulfil the conditions of evolution by natural selection, we must suppose that each step in the perfecting of the likeness to the mimicked species was of special advantage to the mimicking, and enabled larger numbers to survive than of the unmodified. By the time the likeness reached its present stage of perfection the mimicking branch of the race ought to be the more numerous—if, indeed, we ought not to suppose the unmodified branch to have become extinct. If this were so, and the normal *Pieridae* now inhabiting the same region be assumed to have migrated thither from a region where the struggle for existence did not induce mimetic modification, a new difficulty is introduced; for, if the unmodified form can *now* exist, what is there to hinder the variation of the mimicking species which tend to revert to the normal type from doing likewise? Such reverting forms will not be weeded out, and there will be, in consequence, a rapid going back of the whole race to its original form. For an example of the unsatisfactory nature of the answers usually given to these objections I must refer to p. 233 of Professor Poulton's

Colours of Animals. And we must suppose that every mimicking species was brought to its present state of perfection by the constant weeding out of those not varying in the direction of more and more perfect resemblance. This weeding out must have been accomplished by birds and other insect-eating animals, which constantly destroyed all *slight departures* from perfect likeness. But there does not appear to be any evidence that this is so, nor does it seem likely that a bird so keenly interested as to devour all the *slight departures* from the type would be deceived by the perfect form. The fact that mimicked and mimicking species have not been shown to be rapidly *increasing* again points to the conclusion that they, like others, must be largely destroyed in the adult state, and that probably by insectivorous animals.

Mr. Wallace, it is true, takes the fact of a species being abundant as a proof that it is protected. Thus, writing of the butterfly *Kallima Paralekta*, which resembles a withered leaf, he says: "We thus have size, colour, form, markings, and habits all combining together to produce a disguise which may be said to be absolutely perfect; and the protection which it affords is sufficiently indicated by the abundance of the individuals that possess it."¹

But, unless such an abundant species is *rapidly increasing*, there must be in it a *really larger annual* destruction than in a *rare species*. Expression is given by the same writer to a similar fallacy in connection with the genus *Drusilla*, which is mimicked by three different genera, *Melanites*, *Hyantis*, and *Papilio*:

"These insects, like the *Danailæ*, are abundant in individuals, have a very weak and slow flight, and do not seek concealment, or appear to have any means of protection from insectivorous enemies. It is natural to conclude that they have some hidden property which saves them from attack."²

It is not, however, mere *abundance* of individuals in a species, but *increasing numbers* which would indicate immunity from attack. And if we compare in a given district a rare with a very common species, which are both, on the average, just maintaining their numbers, we must admit that the latter were destroyed in *greater numbers*—in other words, that they are *more*, and not *less*, subject to attack.

In speaking of the peculiar shape of wing which is found in so many different genera of butterflies in the island of Celebes, Dr. Wallace gives expression to what appears to me another fallacy. This special form of wing is supposed to give greater facility in making sudden turnings, and thus baffling a pursuer. And the only species of Celebesian *Papilio* whose wings are not thus modified, "being already guarded against attack, have no need of increased power of wing; and natural selection would have no tendency to produce it."

¹ *Natural Selection*, pp. 61, 62.

² *Ibid.* pp. 181-82.

But it is difficult to conceive of a butterfly so *absolutely protected* that such increased powers of wing would be of *no advantage*, and so long as it was of the *slightest benefit* it would tend to be preserved and perfected according to the principles of natural selection. It is, indeed, absurd thus to speak as though natural selection were an *intelligent agent* which could *stop* the evolution of protective characters as soon as a species was *sufficiently protected* to maintain itself. For seeing that variations in the direction of protection occur *irrespective* of the *need* for the same, and that if these are *advantageous*—and further protection from enemies must always be so—natural selection must preserve them, the process cannot be supposed to *stop short of absolute immunity from attack*.

Another writer makes a similarly illogical statement regarding the dying out of very large species of animals. He speaks of their great size as “a final and tremendous effort to secure survival, but a despairing and unsuccessful one!”

Is it not obvious, however, that the size could only be obtained *because it was an advantage*, and the cause of survival? And what is supposed to make the effort? Not the animals themselves—emulating the frog in the fable—that would be ultra-Lamarckism. Nor can natural selection be logically said to *make an effort*, for it merely *allows* favourable variations to survive. The “gigantic stature” is supposed to be the result of the effort, but the context does not indicate what is supposed to make the effort. Both cases in fact are examples of that *illogical* attribution to natural selection of *intelligent purpose* which is so common to the literature of the subject, and by which difficulties are often *slurred over* and so unnoticed by the reader.

If any species were *absolutely free* from attack they would increase inordinately and live down the others. But since even the most protected species are not so increasing they must perish in the struggle for existence as freely as the less protected. A similar argument is applied by Dr. Wallace to bees and wasps. They have not developed protective colours *because* they were already protected by their stings. But neither bees nor wasps are absolutely protected; they are, in fact, eagerly devoured by birds and other insect-eaters. Thus, when Von Siebold was studying parthenogenesis in the wasp *Pollistes gallica*, the birds destroyed such numbers of the nests that he was obliged to protect those he wished to observe with nets!

We know also that not a few species of bees have no sting. If, then, protective colouring enables an insect to escape its bird foes, there is every reason for its development in bees and wasps according to the principles of natural selection.

As a special example of protection, Dr. Wallace mentions certain comparatively soft and eatable beetles, which he thinks are protected

by their resemblance to other species, which are so hard as to turn the point of the entomologist's pin when he tries to transfix them. But it must be remembered that many birds swallow even *stones*; surely, then, *no beetle* could be too hard for them! Others again are able to break *nut-shells*, which would also turn the point of the average entomologist's pin. It might also be suggested that a hungry bird would at least *try* the *hard-looking* beetle with its beak.

As an example of what may be called the more far-fetched cases of supposed protective characters, I will quote Dr. Wallace's example of an American caterpillar, *Bombyx regia* :

"But perhaps the most perfect example of this kind of protection is exhibited by the large caterpillar of the Royal Persimmon moth (*Bombyx regia*), a native of the Southern States of North America, and known there as the 'hickory-horned devil.' It is a large green caterpillar, often six inches long, ornamented with an immense crown of orange-red tubercles, which, if disturbed, it erects and shakes from side to side in a very alarming manner. In its native country the negroes believe it to be as deadly as a rattlesnake, whereas it is perfectly innocuous. The green colour of the body suggests that its ancestors were once protectively coloured; but, growing too large to be effectually concealed, it acquired the habit of shaking its head about to frighten away its enemies, and ultimately developed the crown of tentacles as an addition to its terrifying powers."¹

But to suppose that natural selection could thus evolve a species *too large* for safety seems illogical from the point of view of the writer of the above extract. For the *larger* individuals must have *survived only* because, and when, increased size was *an advantage*. And this must have gone on for countless generations, the *smaller* individuals perishing in the struggle for life. But perhaps Dr. Wallace would contend that size, having *once* been an advantage, *ceased* to be so under changed conditions. In such a case, however, we might naturally suppose that the *small* would then survive and the race become rapidly dwarfed again. Dr. Wallace, however, does not believe this. He thinks that these larger caterpillars being in danger of extermination, some of them took to shaking their heads. This frightened their enemies, and those that shook their heads escaped, while those that did not do so perished. Now why these caterpillars should shake their heads, or why the birds about to eat them should refrain from doing so in consequence, is not very obvious. But letting this pass, we are next asked to believe that among these head-shaking caterpillars some developed a fringe of tentacles round the head. These we are to suppose were still more efficiently preserved, because still more terrifying to their enemies. Thus by slow degrees they became what they are, each step in the development being *more terrifying* to their enemies. As an argument in favour of his view, Wallace brings forward the fact that the natives are afraid to touch the caterpillar. But it is possible they

¹ *Darwinism*, p. 210.

may have other reasons than its supposed terrifying appearance. This is a fair sample of the way such protective characters are supposed to have been evolved.

Against the theory of the evolution of protective characters in insects by natural selection, then, the following objections must be urged:

(1) The difficulty of understanding how a *slight* departure from the normal colour in a freely-eaten form could deceive the keen and trained eye of an insectivorous animal.

(2) The small amount of experimental evidence that "protected species" are avoided, and the inconclusiveness of what is brought forward.

(3) It has not been shown that reversions to the "unprotected" type among mimicking species are weeded out by their enemies. And it seems unlikely that minute variations from the type of perfect mimicry would be noticed by insect-eaters. But without such weeding out there would be reversion.

(4) If any species were *really* protected from those destructive agencies which keep others *in statu quo* as regards numbers, such a species ought to be *rapidly increasing*. But the greater the protection the greater the rate of increase. But protected species have not been shown to be increasing; some of them, indeed, are rare. And the mere fact of a species not increasing implies the annual destruction of immense numbers of individuals.

Protective characters also occur among plants. Thorny and spiny plants, and plants with stinging hairs, are supposed to have been evolved in the same manner as protected insects. Thus, those plants which tended to produce spines and stinging hairs were preserved in each generation, while those not doing so were destroyed. The first difficulty here is that of understanding how an animal in the habit of browsing on a certain kind of plant could be supposed to *avoid* a plant here and there *because* it was—as we must suppose it was at first—*very slightly spiny*, or had *embryonic stinging hairs*.

The second difficulty is that browsing animals *do not avoid* the perfected thorny or spiny plant, or even the stinging nettle. Sea-holly is one of our most spiny plants, and yet on the Norfolk coast, where it grows abundantly, the horses browse on it freely. The donkey's fondness for thistles is proverbial, and many browsing animals eat furze; while the nettle is eaten by snails, several species of caterpillar, as well as by cattle. And it cannot be supposed that browsing animals have been evolved *pari passu* with the plants, so as to enable them to feed on the same, for the staple of their food is grass, and they do not need the others. When we think of *grass*, again, we feel another difficulty. For the grasses are the plants most browsed on by animals, and in which, most of all, anything in the way of spininess ought to have been

developed. Yet these same grasses have, according to some, developed a remarkable series of contrivances to protect their pollen from ants! The grasses, then, show us clearly that plants browsed on by animals do not need either thorns or spines to enable them to increase and multiply—to maintain and extend their place in nature.

We have seen that the protective value of stings in nettles and in bees is a doubtful quantity. Here is another example pointing the same moral, viz., that whatever be the real use of stings, or reason of their development, it is not that they protect their owners from the animals which prey upon them. This interesting case of really formidable stings being no protection is from the *Journal of Sir Joseph Banks*. Shooting an albatross on one occasion, he relates how the bird ejected from its stomach quantities of a species of jelly-fish which is armed with really powerful stings. The bird was evidently wont to feed on them.

Thus, to bring these remarks to an end, there seems to be no substantial foundation, either theoretical or experimental, for the view that "protective characters" have been evolved by the process of natural selection. But if not true, it may at least be claimed for it that it is paradoxical; for it is by the ruthless destruction of individuals that the race is supposed to be protected.

G. W. BULMAN.

MARY ASTELL :

A SEVENTEENTH-CENTURY ADVOCATE FOR WOMEN.

Was there ever an age when women have not been moved to claim some modicum of that justice, the full portion of which we women of the nineteenth century are still claiming and awaiting? Ages long past the daughters of Zelophehad went to Moses and, being women, stood humbly by the door of the Tabernacle, and there pleaded (with marked adroitness and success) for the right to succeed to their deceased father's estate. They asked that their father's name (he having no male children) should not be blotted out of the land. They thus gained a privilege which centuries of custom has made the heritage alike of Jewish and English women similarly situated. But if there ever was a time when women did not resent their subjection and ask that it should be removed, that time was certainly not the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries, for both these periods are remarkable, if not for the number of claimants, yet certainly for the boldness of the claims launched by Englishwomen. This is not surprising when we remember that at that period the educational, as well as the social and political position, had sunk to a very low ebb. When society becomes diseased, then earnest souls search for remedies. Mary Astell, viewing with pain the position of her sister women, thought the matter over, and gave to the world certain proposals of her own.

But before we deal with her proposals it will be well to mention some of the causes which had brought about this general decadence in the position of women. The causes were many and had been growing in force and power since the close of the Wars of the Roses. Prominent among them we must reckon the abolition of the monasteries, so pregnant with far-reaching effects, one of which had been to deprive spiritually-minded women of congenial occupations by taking out of their hands the care of the poor, the aged and the sick. Also by the closing of these institutions vagrancy had largely increased, and there had arisen the need of male officialism in conjunction with the destitution which arose, which destitution could only be dealt with by an ever-growing and increasing Poor Law. Another cause arose from the internal peace which the country enjoyed through the cessation of civil war. Peace had restored men to their homes and to the government of their localities. In mediæval times one certain corollary of war was that local government had to be

largely entrusted to women, and though women in the main only acted for the time being as deputies, yet such as were in possession of estates of their own had, possibly for the first time in their lives, the chance of acting for themselves. Besides this the place and power held by Saxon women had not infrequently, though very often no doubt as a mere matter of national or even local convenience, been maintained by women down to the close of the Wars of the Roses. Women had been governors of castles, had sat on the bench at assizes, and acted as high sheriffs. Great and important hereditary offices, such as those of high constable, high steward, marshal and even champion, were retained in families by females when male heirs failed, and though no doubt only a small proportion of women could enjoy office, a yet larger number shared the pleasure of knowing that sex was no disqualification. Mrs. J. R. Green in a recent article in the *Nineteenth Century* has said: "Such glimpses as we get of the mediæval women in this country may give us the highest idea of her capacity in affairs, her frequent erudition, her just authority." But by the time of the accession of William and Mary there remained but little scope for the energies of women outside the domestic circle, though here and there a woman of high social standing, like Anne, Countess of Dorset, Montgomery and Pembroke, would uphold her rights. This lady having in the reign of Charles II. had her privilege of nominating a knight of the shire interfered with by the then Secretary of State, replied in the famous words: "I have been bullied by a usurper, I have been neglected by a Court, but I will not be dictated to by a subject; your man shan't stand." With less success and in a humbler sphere, certain spinster Puritan women voted at the Suffolk election in 1648, but "at the counting of the said poll, the sheriff, with the allowance and consent of the said two knights themselves," did discount them and cast them out, "conceiving it a matter verie unworthy anie gentleman, and most dishonourable in such an election, to make use of their voices, *although they might in law have been allowed.*" Such attempts to retain authority were wellnigh expiring efforts to stem that stream of circumstances which had swept almost all the positions of women before it. It was mainly for the convenience of men that they had held such positions, and when their services were no longer needed they had to give way.

The effects of the peace secured to the country by the accession of William and Mary were similar to those which followed the marriage of Henry of Lancaster with Elizabeth of York. After the conclusion of both the civil wars, many a lord found time to attend to his manorial duties, and therefore many a deputy wife was relegated to purely domestic concerns. The example of marital dominion set by Henry was doubtless followed in many an English mansion. Henry's chief claim to the throne was through his wife, but he very

determinedly ignored her right to be Queen Regnant and relegated her position to that of Queen Consort. He even deferred her coronation as long as possible, till the people clamoured for it. History would no doubt have repeated itself in this matter of kingly marital authority in the year 1689, had it been possible for William of Orange to have followed the precedent of Henry the Seventh, for William was no less jealous than Henry of his wife's superior claim. But the Crown Regnant had sat on the brows of Mary and Elizabeth Tudor, and Mary's claim could not be ignored. But if at the end of the seventeenth century a queen held place and power, she stood almost alone among women as doing so. A steady and stealthy male encroachment had narrowed the circle of women's activities. The cordon was drawn too tightly. Education seemed the only outlet, and women passionately desired it, and thus we find the women of the later seventeenth century asking for education, and pointing with pride to Lady Jane Grey, the daughters of Sir Thomas More, and other learned ladies of the past.

More painful than even any of the conditions just mentioned, was the low and licentious tone of the age, which dealt with woman, not as a human being, endowed with equal rights, if dissimilar duties, but as a creature created to serve the lowest instincts of man, or at best, as the contemporaneous poet Milton put it---

"He for God only, she for God and him."

And when the "him" was not at all godlike the poor wife had a sorry look out. If we compare the literature of the Elizabethan age with that of Queen Anne, we find that in the latter period the spiritual elements of womanhood were almost entirely ignored, and the chief attributes worth dwelling on are her personal attractions, or detractions as they appeared to men. Her sphere was narrowed to that of pleasing the senses or ministering to the passions. Woman touched with angel instincts had become woman odalisque. We get no glimpse of an ideal womanhood akin to that of Shakespeare's women; no attempt at an Imogen, who remains to this day the finest example of the English type of girl, which type Emerson in his *English Traits* has so happily described in the pithy words, "She is as game as she is mild and mild as she is game."

Against these conditions the heart and conscience of women revolted. Dr. Doran in his *Life of a Lady of the Last Century* tells us that in 1663 a Mrs. Makin started a school for English girls, and wrote a treatise with the object of "reviving the ancient education of gentlewomen." "The barbarous custom of breeding women low is grown general among us, and hath prevailed so far that it is verily believed that women are not endowed with such reason as men." It would be interesting were it possible to trace how much of the desire for education and the admiration for learned women

which runs through the female literature of the century that followed, could be attributed to the efforts of Mrs. Makin. This much we, who can look back, know, that the time was rotten ripe for change, and when Mrs. Makin issued her prospectus, there had already come into the world a female child who would resent with signal literary ability and power "the barbarous custom of breeding women low," and that child was Mary Astell.

Far be it from me to wish to detract by one word from the solid claim to the gratitude of women so ably earned by Mary Wollstonecraft, but "honour must be given to whom honour is due," and Mary Astell advocated justice for her sex, a century before Mary Wollstonecraft published her *Rights of Women*. Nor were other women contemporaneous with Mary Astell quite silent. Lady Chudleigh, born in 1656, was reputed to be a zealous assertor of "the female right to literature." She was the author of a satirical poem on the position of wives and the claim of women to education. *The Ladies' Defence* consists of an amusing dialogue between Melissa, Sir William Loveall, Sir John Brute, and a parson. Sir William fears that were women educated, men would not get anything higher than chambermaids for their wives! Sir John Brute declares:

"By heaven, I wish 'twere by the law decreed
They never more should be allowed to read."

The parson argues:

"Women were not for this purpose made,
And should not our prerogative invade;
Whate'er they know should be from us conveyed."

Melissa opens with:

"Wife and servant are the same,
But only differ in the name.

* * * *

Beauty's a trifle merits not my care:
I'd rather Æsop's ugly visage wear,
Join'd with his mind, than be a fool and fair.

* * * *

Yours be the fame, the profit and the praise;
We'll neither rob you of your vines nor bays.
You shall be chief, and still yourselves admire;
Nor will we to dominion once aspire.
The tyrant man shall still possess the throne;
'Tis in our minds that we would rule alone.
And by a powerful influence on our lives,
Make us good maids, good neighbours, and good wives."

She concludes with:

"Value yourselves and men despise,
You must be proud if you'll be wise."

The modern critic will no doubt carp at "and men despise," but we must remember that Lady Chudleigh was only giving one Roland for many an Oliver. These brief extracts fairly represent the average male thought of the times, and give us a glimpse of the growing dissatisfaction among women. To again quote from Mrs. Green's *Woman's Place in Literature*: "Tremulous at first and gently deprecating, as wary pioneers they crossed the borders of the land of letters and surveyed new fields to conquer. From book-making they generally refrained till the middle of the last century." This testimony does but add to our surprise at the power and originality of Mary Astell's opinions, and also of those of her even more brilliant successor, "Sophia, a person of quality," who wrote in the first half of the eighteenth century. Of neither of these writers can it be said that they entered the field of literature with tremulous or uncertain step in regard to the message they had to give to women. Modesty, and not fear, at first led Mary Astell to publish anonymously. "Sophia" remains to this day an undiscovered author. It was very much the fashion of the times for even male authors to withhold their names in the early editions of their works. Pope frequently did so. Behind these champions followed the more prudent and timorous, who, but for the courage of such leaders, might for ever have kept silence.

Mary Astell was born at Newcastle-on-Tyne in the year 1668. She was educated in Latin, French, mathematics, and natural philosophy by her uncle, a clergyman—studies usually beyond the reach of English girls till quite recent years, with the notable exceptions of many fortunate members of the Quaker and Unitarian bodies. To these exceptions we may trace the undue but most honourable proportion of women workers which these sects have contributed to philanthropic work and to the "Woman Question" during the last forty years.

Mary Astell came to London at the age of twenty, and in 1694 she published her first work, *A Serious Proposal to the Ladies*. This was followed, in 1697, by *A Defence of the Ladies*, and in 1700 by *Reflections on Marriage*. Her *Serious Proposal to the Ladies* had for its chief purpose the double object of founding a college for the higher education of women, which should also serve as a retreat for such as desired a secluded and intellectual life. In support of her proposal she argues that learning ennobles women, and quotes Watson to show the quality of the women whom the sixteenth century produced. "It was so very modish," said Watson, "that the fair sex seemed to believe that Greek and Latin added to their charms, and Plato and Aristotle untranslated were frequent ornaments of their closets. One would think, by its effects, it was the proper way of educating them, since there are no accounts in history of so many great women in any age as are to be found between

1500 and 1600." Ballard, in his *Memoirs of British Ladies*, describes Mary Astell as having a "piercing wit," solid judgment, and tenacious memory. "The learning and knowledge she had gained, together with her generosity and benevolence, taught her to regret the loss of learning to her sex, the want of which, she justly observed, was the principal cause of their flinging themselves into so many follies and inconveniences. The scheme given in her proposal seemed so reasonable, and wrought so far upon a certain great lady, that she had designed giving £10,000 towards erecting a sort of college for the education and improvement of the female sex, and as a retreat for those ladies who, nauseating the parade of the world, might there find a happy recess from the noise and worry of it. But this design coming to the ears of Bishop Burnet, he immediately went to that lady and remonstrated so powerfully against it, telling her it would look like a way for Popish orders, and that it would be taken for a nunnery, &c., that he utterly frustrated the noble design." And thus it was left to the women of this age to carry out the century-and-a-half old dream of Mary Astell by the foundation of colleges for the higher education of women and the establishment of Protestant sisterhoods. It would seem, however, that something akin to the idea was, some half-century later, carried out by Mrs. Scott (the unhappy sister of Mrs. Montagu) and Lady Bab Montagu, by the establishment of their conventual house at Batheaston, which they formed for the training of boys and girls.

Mary Astell at first published anonymously, giving no clue beyond "as one who loved her sex"—a most true description, for she was to her heart's core their fervid advocate and generous defender. "Women," she said, "are God's great gift, capable by proper learning and training to arrive at the greatest perfection. She who rightly understands wherein the perfection of her nature consists will lay out her thoughts and industry in the acquisition of such perfection."

Mary Astell must be regarded as the pioneer of the modern "Women's Rights" movement. The influence of her thoughts and her arguments may be clearly traced from her day to this. "Women need not take up with mean things, since (if they are not wanting to themselves) they are capable of the best. The incapacity, if any, is acquired, not natural." "The soil is rich, and would if well cultivated produce a noble harvest; if then the unskilful managers not only prevent, but encourage noxious weeds, though we shall suffer by their neglect, yet they ought not in justice to blame any but themselves if they reap the fruit of their own folly. That women are a plague and dishonour to some men is not much to be regretted on account of the men, because it is the product of their own folly in denying them the benefit of an ingenious and liberal education, the most efficient means to direct them into and to secure

their progress in the ways of virtue." "Women are from their very infancy debarred those advantages with the want of which they are afterwards reproached." The treatise earnestly exhorts women "to rise superior to folly and vanity, and to secure by wisdom and virtue a happiness denied to the majority of their sex."

In 1697 was published *A Defence of the Female Sex*, to a later edition of which was appended a poem by James Drake, a celebrated physician, and author of several religious and political pamphlets, for which he more than once narrowly escaped imprisonment; and the third edition was made yet more attractive to the common mind by the announcement on the frontispiece that characters were inserted of :

A Pedant.	A Virtuoso.
A Squire.	A Poetaster.
A Beau.	A City Critick, &c.

It was also adorned with a well-executed woodcut of two beaux, powdered and patched :

"This vain, gay thing sets up for man.
But see what fate attends him :
The powd'ring barber first began,
The barber-surgeon ends him !"

The defence was written at the request of a lady, and was with her consent shown to a few ladies and gentlemen, and by them asked to be made public. It was dedicated to Anne, Princess of Denmark. The preface says, "Romantic days are over, and there is not so much as a Don Quixote of the Quill to succour distressed damsels." We see in the third edition that her challenge brought forth a Don Quixote in the person of James Drake, for to that edition is appended a poem complimentary to her, of which I will only give one line :

"The whole sex shines in your reflected light."

The preface says : "Nowhere have women so easy a servitude as in England, but fetters of gold are still fetters, and the softest lining can never make them so easy as liberty. . . . I have only endeavoured to reduce the sexes to a level, and by arguments to raise ours to an equality at most with the men." She argues : "There is no difference of sex in souls, no disadvantage in the organisation of their bodies ; that throughout the animal kingdom the female is the equal of the male ; and that women of all classes are more ready and polite than the men of those classes." "To plead for the oppressed and to defend the weak seemed to me a generous undertaking, for though it may always be secure, it is not always honourable to run over to the stronger party."

In 1700 Mary Astell published her *Reflections on Marriage*, to which was added a preface. The work was given forth anonymously, "for who would care to pull upon themselves a hornet's nest." A third edition appeared in 1706, which gave the sex, but not the name of the author. It was necessary to add to the preface, for "a certain gentleman" (possessed of a literary kleptomania akin to that of Liggins of *Adam Bede* notoriety) "had owned the *Reflections* so far as to affirm that he had the original manuscript in his closet," for which Mary Astell returns him all due acknowledgment; but, she says, "she was prompted to write, and neither advised with friends nor turned over ancient and modern authors, nor prudently submitted to the correction of such as think they are good judges, but with an *English* spirit and genius set upon the forlorn hope, meaning no hurt to anybody, nor designing anything but the public good, and to retrieve if possible the native liberty, the rights and privileges of the subject." The italics are mine. These pertinent words can only be fully understood by those who realise what was the position of an English wife, not alone two hundred, but even twenty years ago. A great many Acts of Parliament have been passed during the present reign with the object of securing to married women the right to their own earnings, property, persons, and children, and the goal of liberty is not yet reached. It is only in the last few years that the legal decision in the famous Clitheroe Case has cleared away the common notion that a husband has an indisputable right to hold his wife captive against her will. Did space allow, it would be well to give every word of the preface. Un-sparing satire is used to show the absurdity of supposing *every* man superior to *every* woman. And such opinions to prevail during the glorious reign of a queen! (Anne). "If so, it would be a sin for any woman to have dominion over any man, and the greatest queen ought not to command, but to obey, her footman! Because no municipal law can supersede the law of nature." She shares Lady Chudleigh's opinion as to the position of wives, that a "woman should not reckon it a piece of preferment when she is taken for a man's upper servant. It is no advantage to her in this world, but, by its trials, if rightly managed, may prove one to her in the next." Comparisons are drawn between the inducements offered to the sexes to excel. "Titles, authority, power, and riches themselves are the rewards given to men. But if, in spite of all difficulties, nature prevails, and women are not so ignorant as their masters would have them, they are stared upon as monsters, censured, envied, in every way discouraged, or at best they have the fate the proverb assigns them: 'Virtue is praised and starved'"—a proverb, by-the-by, which has this year received at Cambridge such a signal modern illustration for women. The "piercing wit" of Mary Astell clearly saw that the services rendered by women to the community are quite

as important as those given by men. "The wisdom and contrivance of Providence is abundantly manifested, for, as the one sex is fortified with courage and ability to undergo the necessary drudgery of producing materials for the existence of both, so the other is furnished with ingenuity and prudence for the ordinary management and distribution of it, for the relief and comfort of a family, and is over and above enriched with a peculiar tenderness and care to the cherishing of their poor helpless offspring." The *Reflections on Marriage* are concluded in a paragraph in which Mary Astell attempts to convey her own unselfish enthusiasm to other women less happily situated than herself. "She will discern a time when her sex shall be no bar to the best employments, the highest honours; a time when that distinction, now so much used to her prejudice, shall be no more, but, provided she is not wanting in herself, her soul shall shine as the greatest hero's. This is true, and, indeed, the only consolation. This makes her a sufficient compensation for all the neglect and contempt the ill-grounded customs of the world throw on her, for all the injuries brutal power may do her, and is a sufficient cordial to support her spirits, be her lot in the world what it may."

It is no part of the scope of this article to dwell on other writings of Mary Astell beyond those she contributed to the woman's question. Despite her advanced ideas, she was conservative in her political and religious opinions, and warmly defended Church and State. The Bishop of Rochester, whose sermon she had criticised, says of her in a letter to a contemporary: "There is not an expression which carries the least air of her sex from the beginning to the end of it. She attacks me very home, and artfully enough, under a pretence of taking my part against other divines. . . . I dread to engage her, so I only write a general civil answer to her, and leave the rest to an oral conference." The Bishop evidently realised the "piercing wit" of Mary Astell.

But less by her "piercing wit" than by her warmth of heart will Mary Astell be tenderly remembered. Her own words were: "She wrote as one who loved her sex." She led the way for that ever-increasing procession of women who walk through life having their chief desire to work as women who love women, and to give services to ennoble womanhood, though in their lives they may be very much misunderstood, and their services ignored and almost forgotten, like those of Mary Astell.

She made no demand for the Parliamentary vote. The Parliamentary vote was then the privilege of but a small minority of men, and the deprivation of it was not so glaring an injustice to women as it is now. Much that she pointed out as so grossly unjust to women was not attempted to be removed till more than a century and a half after her death. Among her well-known

friends were Lady Mary Wortley Montagu and Lady Elizabeth Hastings. She died as she had lived, a notable example of calm and heroic courage. Ballard tells us, "She underwent an operation for cancer without struggling or even giving a groan or sigh, and when the end of life was drawing near she had her coffin and shroud brought to her bedside that her thoughts might never waver from eternity."

She passed away in 1731, but her mantle fell on one (possibly her dear friend), "Sophia, a person of quality," who was to take up, with even added force, passion and power, the pen which death had left still. No breath of calumny seems to have ever touched her name, and there is abundant evidence in her writings to show that she was possessed of that divine enthusiasm for justice which invariably carries its devotees, as with eagle wings, over a world of sin and sorrow, in which, for others, they walk and never weary, work and never faint.

UNDOGMATIC RELIGION.

It seems inevitable that man should lay down in propositions, and set out by figures of speech, the conclusions of his understanding, just as in his untiring energy he turns the surface of the earth into a network of roads, railways, and canals. This effort to externalise thought results in dogma. Dogma, therefore, may be recognised as an outward expression of the activities of the mind. It is an investiture of the spirit of man, infinitely various, in keeping with his inner variableness. In every department of human affairs, except in religion, this view of the nature of dogma is acted upon. In religion, however, all the great theologies work upon the idea of dogma as having the characters of fixity and finality. The respect which every wise thinker renders to what has been thought and done by the great men of these and bygone days is supplanted in the minds of the majority of religious people by an idolatrous sense of the infallible. With them the notion prevails that the tenets which a person may have as an outfit for one stage in the journey of life should be his sole possession throughout all its vicissitudes. Hence, in the history of religion, as well as in the ecclesiastical systems of to-day, it is held to be of the utmost importance that men should have a set of conclusive opinions about the origin and destiny of the world, and that they should have fixed occasions and forms for the culture of devotion. And from these, which undoubtedly have served as helpful prescriptions in the experience of a considerable number of people, there has emanated a sort of spiritual absolutism, under the sway of which the feeling is widely diffused among the great religious communions that it is a fatal course to attempt the following of the religious life on any plan less dogmatic than that which is found within their systems.

But there is another attitude towards religion, which may be described as the undogmatic position. This is taken by those who interpret God and man and the universe, not by a single book or set of books, not by one man or any hierarchy of men, not even by an institution, an age, or a dispensation, but by the suggestions which arise in the mind while it contemplates with unwarped interest the stupendous drama of life.

When we think deeply about it, how immense is life : how significant, august, and yet what 'meanness mingles with its majesty !

What man is so intellectually compendious as to be able to epitomise life, or where is the institution or human order so comprehensive as to manifest more than a fragment of its meaning?

And when we take account of the wide variety of circumstances in which men are born, and the infinitely different experiences through which they pass from birth to maturity, we see how reasonable it is to expect an equal variety in their stock of notions as well as in their mental and moral constitutions. So that it appears quite in the nature of things to look for a state of religious life wherein the principle of variety, which has already operated by substituting many creeds for one creed, will ultimately displace the creed altogether as a unifying element. When this takes place the churches will no longer be institutions for perfecting men by making them all think alike, and ever the same, but they will exist as brotherhoods with different external features, all inspired according to their several capacities with high social affection and intense spiritual life.

Can we, then, be wrong in thinking that the secret of a true religious life lies, not in trying to bring our beliefs about the temporal and the eternal into line with those of the men who gave the Churches their creeds, but is to be found in the widest reading of the experience of all time; in contact with, not undue subjection to, the best minds; in admitting to the affections the sweet attractions of the purest examples; and, above all these, in the inspiration which quickens the soul with the consciousness of a Greater Soul whom men call God.

We may be further assured of the reality and vitality of what is here called undogmatic religion when we remember that only a small minority of mankind are able to appreciate the value of a formal proposition. The prepossessions of the moment are too strong in most people to enable them to admit any but concrete impressions to their minds. And it is probable that indifference to the great human interests is due almost as much to a deficient endowment or development of the imaginative faculty in men as to their habits of selfishness. Thus thirty-nine articles of belief of the most tremendous significance can be passed through the mind—as a sieve—leaving scarcely a grain of consciousness behind, but any act of generosity or heroism done in the sight of the humblest person fills him with a larger sense of existence; and the sorrow that casts its shadow upon a human soul is certain to draw some other heart in to share the gloom and brighten it with the power of sympathy.

We may therefore confidently affirm that it is a character informed by principle, rather than one which has been drilled under dogmatic propositions, which yields the bloom and fruitfulness of spiritual growth, such growth springing from the thoughtful interest and sympathy that surround the individual in his emotional periods. In the recognition of this view the Churches are giving

more attention to the thoughts and ways of children, by understanding which they may enable them to use in the best way the helps to self-improvement which are the peculiar possession of our time.

It comes, further, as a persuasion to the intellectually sensitive and reverent mind that there is something better than having a dogmatic answer to the great perplexities of religion; something more potent and consoling than finality of religious belief, and an unvarying system of religious observances; that in place of this it is a true and inexhaustible possession to have a deep self-knowledge, an honourable humility, and a constantly renewed purpose of self-mastery, all interwoven with a regard for the welfare of other men, and a healthy interest in what has been and now is in the world.

Religion is not a concern of the intellect so much as a state of the emotions and an affair of character. For what is religion in its deepest significance but the surrender of the human spirit in worship and love of the Universal Being that transcends its own local being? And what, in its practical aspect, is religion but the ruling of all the thought and conduct of the individual by consideration for the good of society? May we not then speak of the aim of undogmatic religion as an endeavour to live at the centre of things, to lay under tribute to individual and social growth every province and order of activity and experience, to be unsatisfied except with the fullest knowledge, the largest inferences, and the most complete illustrations of life in Nature and in man.

Of course while we assign limits to the activity of the intellect in relation to religion, it is not to be assumed that we exclude the actuality of its influence. Clearness of thought, and order, in regard to the operations of the mind, are part of a natural and vigorous religious state; it is only against the deification of logic and attempts to place the manacles of rigid definition upon the free energies of the soul, that any contention needs to be sustained.

It is not, however, wise to assume that the effort to conduct the religious life upon the amplest plane is without peril in the present constitution of things. The man who crosses the sea has a greater likelihood of meeting with adventures than the man who merely crosses his own threshold. So it may be granted that by keeping strictly within the bounds of an orthodox interpretation and discipline, the career of a religious person may be exempt from demands for caution which spring from the necessities of more adventurous circumstances. We have to remember also that the world exists not only for the brave but for the weak; that it is intended to minister to the conquered as well as to the conqueror; and it would indeed be an aggravation of the mystery and pain of life if we could not trust that in some other state every soul shall have its share in the fruition that waits upon the boundless harvestings of time and destiny.

It does not surprise so much as it amuses one to observe how often an aversion from the dogmatic in religion is associated with a liking for the dogmatisms of science. And so long as there appears a tendency among those who tread the now well-worn path of positive knowledge to set an extravagant value upon what they know, it will be useful to reflect that there can be no spiritual advantage in a mere exchange of idols. It is a new spirit alone that is capable of bringing thought and feeling into workable relations within the personality of the independent seeker after truth.

The resources which such an one draws upon are those that lie open to all men, but which he is likely to use in the freest and largest measure. The accumulated experience of mankind, inscrutably tinged with individual persistencies, gives him insight into human nature; and the apparently wayward courses of events teach him to regard the unexpectedness of life as an element of mental discipline. For him, as for all men, those makers of history—the poet, the thinker, the explorer, and the administrator—are at work, furnishing the material that constitutes his mental and moral perspective. Thus it is possible for a man to disentangle from his view of life that which tends to the fragmentary and the accidental, in order that he may discern the limits of the temporary within the realm of the eternal.

The English Bible is one of the resources that may be mentioned in particular, to illustrate the working of the undogmatic spirit. Now the popular idea of this series of translations from the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures is that they are a revelation, an unaltered and infallible record of what God has sent as a message to men. But the man of the undogmatic spirit examining the history and contents of these writings in a candid, fearless, and teachable temper sees that the popular idea of the Bible must be an erroneous one. He is convinced of this when he recognises that the ideas of the original writings have had to pass by transference from the languages of two ancient peoples into our modern tongue; and he knows also that a very large portion of the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments related to conditions of life remote from our experience. He is careful, therefore, to estimate all that appears casual, local, and of indirect reference to the needs of to-day at its true value, while he submits himself to the inspiration which enlarges his nature as he realises the heights and depths of human travail, and how man has been infinitely perplexed, yet also unutterably comforted, by that Presence to whom in our deepest consciousness we do not fear to give the name of Father.

Again, while regarding the English Bible as the highest authority for us in respect of conduct, and an inspired commentary upon life; while delighting, too, in its wide range of interest, and the restfulness which it affords the afflicted mind; it is part of the undogmatic

position to admit that these Scriptures are not the universal, and may not be the final, embodiment of inspiration and precept for spiritual ends.

It remains for us to consider undogmatic religion as it relates to the exercises and observances which are common to the profession of religion. All kinds of people have been influenced by such means of edification, but all have not been conspicuously edified. It is the ordinary experience of a large number of persons that public worship, prayer-meetings, and family worship are uninspiring and of no effect. It would, however, be irrational to urge that because acts of private devotion and the public services of the Churches are not invariably what they are intended to be they should be given up. Yet, perhaps, with greater adaptability to changing circumstances and needs, they might have more spontaneity and truer unction.

Moreover, for the person who is free to contrive his own plan of life, the question of maintaining true spontaneity and integrity in his religion will ever be immediate and paramount. He should be able to use all times, events, and places with the spirit of devotion. The desire for reality and universality ought to mark all his thought and action, enabling him to profit from society as well as from solitude. This ideal is a prompting of undogmatic religion, and while it lifts the religious man above the necessity of rigid attendance upon public worship, and the expedient of having set times and forms for private devotion, it by no means constrains him to exclude himself from the use of such means. And it is not to be forgotten that the real function of public worship lies in its collective and social ends. The weak and the infirm may resort to the House of God for the satisfying of their individual needs, but the strong spiritual man must feel, beyond the sense of his own demands, an expansive sympathy working out towards all that may stimulate and confirm his fellow-worshippers.

As all difficulty in action is relative to the breadth or complexity of design, so it must be that the larger and freer an aim in religion is the greater demands it will make upon the man who attempts its fulfilment. A few words may therefore be said about the difficulties which beset those who follow after the ideals of the undogmatic spirit.

Owing to the mind being freely accessible to impressions it must be more difficult to classify them and give them due position. In the case of a person who ranks himself among the orthodox professors of religion, he has his formulæ, and he fences himself round by a policy of limitation and exclusion. But it is otherwise with the man of the wholly free spirit: he seeks the greatest number and variety of ideas, and exposes himself to the widest range of influences; thus he undertakes a larger task in the effort of self-government than if he had been content with a more restricted sphere of

activity. Not only does he need to co-ordinate those great personal forces—intellect and emotion—but he must find a principle of correction which may prevent expansiveness becoming a disintegrating aimlessness, and remove from a disciplinary reserve the danger of passing into stifling narrowness.

Another difficulty will be found in the fact that the line of action and the moral emphasis will differ from those which form the main current of religious activity. In this way there must be an apparent opposition to, or dissent from, the order which brings all the lustre of the past to spread a glamour over the susceptible mind. This, although an impalpable obstacle, is nevertheless a real one. It is true it may serve to detach from the independent spirit a love of the factitious, but another and larger effect will show itself in a misinterpreting of the principles which are involved. The penalty which men too often impose upon those who seriously differ from them is ostracism. There are, moreover, more severe methods in modern ostracism than the classic one of inscribing the vote of exclusion upon a shell; and in the most common and intangible form the individual who is ostracised is never able to grapple with the influence which is at work to malign his principles and interfere with his success.

One other difficulty which deserves notice is that of the tendency in a state of religious independence towards a too self-centred interest. It is a paradox, but yet a truth, that over the purpose to live a life of the largest interest and utmost variety there hangs the possibility of inducing a diseased self-consciousness. The strain of continually seeking true equipoise, and of judging all things from principles of central relation, tends to throw the individual back upon himself, or to bring himself too absorbingly into view, hence the egoism of the situation. This is undoubtedly possible, but it is not inevitable; it forms a reason for care in laying out the spiritual energies, not for a parsimonious shutting of them up in well-guarded seclusion.

There may be some who will say that the scheme of life, to which there is here given the loose title of Undogmatic Religion, is too ambitious; that such attempts can only result in vapid sentimentalism, and in substituting for practical regenerative effort an optimistic living in reverie. The danger is there we may admit, but one simple expedient is ever at hand for avoiding an enervated religion; this is to be instant on principle in responding to the duty that lies nearest; and there is one complete answer to the suspicion of an overleaping ambition: this is in the thought of the man who measures his ideal by the consequences which are expected to follow its embodiment, so as to determine if it has promise of keeping the life at the level of free, intelligent, and deeply earnest movement.

It would be a poor depreciation of religious forms and ceremonies

that had only indifference as its origin. Indifference is the root or sign of spiritual decline. But the motive of the life which has been here outlined is enlargement, not dissipation, of religious force. It is not an irresponsible and irreverent objection to habits and methods without any regard to their temporary uses for a large number of people, but it is a grave and deep persuasion of the relativity of all prescriptions and institutions of religion. And as all the conceptions and ordinances of the religious community only prefigure, but do not fill out, the amplest measure of the spiritual potencies in man, so he who has ardour, insight, and tenacity may aim at fixing his being in roots of the widest and deepest spiritual consciousness.

What the disciple of the undogmatic spirit does, in fact, is to embody in his everyday life those ideas of the spiritual which most religious people only suffer to exist in the region of the imagination. For the central conviction of the undogmatic position makes man's relation to the world of spirit a fact of deep personal import of which all forms and ceremonies are but shadows. And is not this also implied in the teaching of the pulpit? So taking the general idea of a Personal, Omnipresent, Omnipotent Being, which is the accredited doctrine of orthodox religion, what the disciple of undogmatic religious interpretation does is to act upon the reality of the idea, making it a motor of conduct and a theme of perennial reflection.

Undogmatic religion, then, is not a mere haze of negational feeling; it has positive aims, only they are not fossilised objects of textual definition, but are living elements of consciousness—a consciousness that is too various and potential to admit of minute or fixed description; indeed, it is as man is in his whole nature, not a mechanism, but a growth, urged constantly to a fuller unfolding by the divine principle that pervades the universe.

GEO. WM. BOAG.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

It is certainly high time that education in England should be placed upon a more scientific basis than it is at present, and we may welcome any effort, however small, which tends in the right direction. For this reason we can commend Miss Mulliner's translation of Herbart's letters on the *Application of Psychology to the Science of Education*.¹ Though the fragmentary character of Herbart's letters renders them of less value than a treatise would have been, they nevertheless contain many things which are suggestive. The principal thing is that the capacity of the individual pupil for culture should be studied, though how this is to be done under our present system it is difficult to see. Our method is the machine-method, and a great change will have to take place in the directors of our educational system before any considerable improvement can be effected. Miss Mulliner has spared no pains to make Herbart of use to those who are interested in the subject, and, besides the translation and notes, contributes an introduction of more than one hundred well-written pages to the elucidation of his ideas.

A discourse on *The Place of Immortality in Religious Belief*,² by Professor J. Estlin Carpenter, of Manchester College, Oxford, is essentially modern in spirit. The familiar tones of the Christian dogmatist are entirely absent from these pages. Mr. Carpenter, though a theologian, ranges himself, in spirit at least, by the side of Wordsworth, Emerson, and Tennyson, rather than by St. Paul, and his calm and lofty eloquence carries the reader along with him, and if it leaves some unconvinced, it strikes no jarring note. The book is but a small one, and it can be read with pleasure by the religious Agnostic as well as by the Theist. The orthodox Churchman perhaps may prefer the Nicene Creed ; but broad Churchmen of all denomina-

¹ *The Application of Psychology to the Science of Education*. By Johann Friedrich Herbart. Translated and edited, with Notes and an Introduction to the Study of Herbart, by Beatrice C. Mulliner, B.A. With a Preface by Dorothea Beale. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co. 1898.

² *The Place of Immortality in Religious Belief*. A discourse, by J. Estlin Carpenter, M.A. London : Philip Green. 1898.

tions will find this discourse valuable to them if they wish to speak or write upon this great theme.

*Father John of the Greek Church*¹ is a disappointment. We hoped to have learned more about the famous preacher and healer than Dr. Whyte tells us in an attractive-looking little book of less than one hundred pages. Dr. Whyte has an enthusiastic admiration for mystics generally and Father John in particular. The appreciation is in a measure more appreciative of the Greek Church than we should have expected, and Father John's diary is described as "precious and epoch-making." Dr. Whyte can scarcely be described as a well-balanced writer, he allows himself too much to be carried away by his subject. The extracts from Father John's own writings are in the tone familiar to every reader of *The Imitation* and the *Theologia Germanica*.

Fallen Angels: a Disquisition upon Human Existence, an Attempt to Elucidate some of its Mysteries, especially those of Evil and Suffering, by One of Them. We congratulate this "fallen angel" on having obtained so much popularity as to be able to issue a fourth edition of the book with the portentous title we have quoted. The general theory of the book is a kind of Christian adaptation of the theosophical doctrine of re-incarnation. As far as we can gather the author holds the opinion that evil spirits, animals (and perhaps plants) and men are all fallen angels working their way upward through a series of incarnations. If this is so, we are struck by the thought of how large a proportion of the inhabitants of a better world must at some time or other brought suffering upon themselves by their disobedience. (Gay & Bird.)

The fifth volume of the Eversley Edition of the Holy Bible contains the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, and the Lamentations. It deserves the same commendation that we have given to the previous volumes. (Macmillan & Co.)

¹ *Father John of the Greek Church*. An Appreciation. With some characteristic passages of his mystical and spiritual autobiography, collected and arranged by Alexander Whyte, D.D. Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier. 1898.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

CONSIDERING the high estimation in which *Les Mœurs, Institutions, et Cérémonies des Peuples de l'Inde*, by the Abbé Dubois, has been held since its publication in 1816, it does seem extraordinary that the second and revised edition by the Abbé himself should have remained unpublished up to now. The original MS. was completed in 1806, and sent to England in 1807 by the East India Company to be translated and published. This MS. was returned to Dubois in 1815, who thereupon made so many additions and corrections, the result of many years of additional study and investigation, that it became practically a different work altogether. It is from this revised MS., and from later additions and corrections made by Dubois three years before he left India, and which was sent by the Madras Government to England, that Mr. Henry K. Beauchamp has prepared the present edition of *Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies*.¹

This MS., says Mr. Beauchamp, "was completely altered, recast, and enlarged, until it bore hardly more resemblance to the original work than a rough outline sketch does to a finished picture. And yet this rough sketch, so to speak, has up to this day been all that English readers have had presented to them of the Abbé's work." The fact unfortunately was that the original MS. had been published before the revised work reached England. In a prefatory note to the present edition, Mr. Max Müller shows how difficult it is to believe that Dubois died so late as 1818, since, by his position as a scholar and student of Indian subjects, he really belongs to a period prior to the revival of Sanskrit studies in India inaugurated by Wilkins, Sir William Jones, and Colebrooke. He also is careful to point out that Dubois was more conversant with the literature and language of Tamil rather than of Sanskrit, and that the whole of his life was spent in the Dekhan and in the Madras Presidency.

In spite of the immense mass of literature which has appeared upon this subject since the Abbé wrote, Mr. Beauchamp has no hesitation in saying "that it is as valuable to-day as ever it was, even more valuable in some respects." And, indeed, it appears to us that there can be no two opinions as to its extreme value, especially in its completed form, with the explanatory notes added by Mr. Beauchamp. Those notes, we may add, are limited to

¹ *Hindu Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies*. By the Abbé J. A. Dubois. Translated from the author's later French MS., and edited, with Notes, Corrections, and Biography, by Henry K. Beauchamp. With a Prefatory Note by the Right Hon. F. Max Müller, and a Portrait. Two volumes. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1897.

corrections of mistakes brought to light by later knowledge, and to explanations and comparisons required by modern thought and the changes which have taken place amongst the educated Hindus since Dubois wrote.

Of the Abbé's personal history little is known. Born about 1770, as he himself tells us, he fled from the horrors of the Revolution and sailed for India as a missionary. Living with the natives as one of them, adopting their clothes, habits, manners of life, and even their very prejudices, he gained their entire confidence, whereas the European officials remained complete strangers to everything but the more prominent and superficial facts of native life. As might be expected, this work, composed in the midst of the people themselves, is, as Mr. Beauchamp rightly states, of a unique character, combining, as no other work, "a recital of the broad facts of Hindu religion and Hindu sociology, with many masterly descriptions, at once comprehensible and minute, of the *vie intime* of the people among whom he lived for so many years."

It is not our purpose to attempt any review of the work itself, which in its original form has long been a standard authority; but the Abbé's preface, now for the first time published, shows breadth of mind and deepness and clearness of thought of this wonderful man. In this he anticipates the Mutiny, and foretells its chief cause as the interference with the social and religious practices of the people. He indicates clearly the basis of the British rule in India and the attitude towards it of the natives. He seems to advise a participation by the natives in the civil administration, and he freely acknowledges the immense difficulties lying in the way of the Government in administering this vast empire according to Western ideas of civilisation and progress with the limited resources of India. And in his day we must remember India was believed to be an Eldorado of inexhaustible wealth. To Dubois the poverty of the country was the most serious apprehension.

Most remarkable, perhaps, of all are the Abbé's *Letters on the State of Christianity in India*, published soon after his return to France, in which he sought to show the utter impossibility of converting the Hindus as a nation to any sect of Christianity. "Let the Christian religion," he declared, "be presented to these people under every possible light, . . . the time of conversion has passed away, and under existing circumstances there remains no human possibility of bringing it back." We ourselves have long been of this opinion, and we wish the Indian Government had the courage of its opinions in this matter, and put an end to a proselytising system which does more harm than good, and much weakens our civil administration. As Dubois himself admits, and as every missionary would be bound to admit under cross-examination, the natives only

become converted for some self-interested motive or another, and become bigger rascals than they were before. Mr. Beauchamp has earned the gratitude of all for his research and the eminently able manner in which he has translated and edited this work, so as to make it at last worthy of its truly remarkable author.

In the present reactionary state of politics in this country, *The Life of Francis Place*,¹ by such a competent writer on economics and political science as Mr. Graham Wallas, is most opportune. The position of the two great parties to-day in many respects, though not, of course, to the same extent, bears some resemblance to the position of the Whigs and Tories just after the cessation of the great French wars in 1815.

Of the two parties at this time Place wrote: "There is no real difference between the Whig and the Tory factions, except the difference which always existed—namely, that the Tories would exalt the kingly power that it might trample upon the aristocracy and the people, while the Whigs would establish an aristocratical oligarchy to trample on the king and the people." We do not mean to say that the difference is the same in character at the present time, but just as in those days each party was guided in its legislative measures by pure opportunism, so to-day the official Liberals are out of touch with that great mass of radical sentiment which undoubtedly exists, and just as they lose the courage of their opinions, so far do they cease to lead Liberal opinion. The Conservatives of to-day represent the opportunism of the Whig and Tory factions, and the Liberal leaders seem to us to be sinking into the condition of the Whigs, who, as Place said, represented only their own money or their patrons', and who looked towards the Government as a means of providing for themselves or their relations. In fact, as we have often observed of late, the official Liberals have not kept up with the tide of democratic progress, and have, to a large extent, ceased to represent the working classes.

A life, then, of the "tailor of Charing Cross" in such able hands as those of Mr. Wallas is, in our opinion, of inestimable value at the present moment. Place was one of those rare types of men, at once a practical politician and an economic and political thinker far in advance of his time. He had worked his way up from a journeyman breeches-maker to a master tailor, and his shop at Charing Cross became the centre of nearly all the progressive movements of the times. As an organiser he was unrivalled—an art learned in the formation of the early trades unions and friendly societies, of

¹ *The Life of Francis Place 1771-1854.* By Graham Wallas, M.A., Lecturer at the London School of Economics and Political Science. London: Longman, Green & Co. New York and Bombay. 1898.

which he was the moving spirit. It was he who made Westminster a political power of the highest influence, and in 1818, when he gave up his business to his son, he devoted himself almost entirely to politics, and single-handed carried the repeal of the infamous Combination Laws, and was a powerful coadjutor in the Reform movement. A friend and follower of Bentham and James Mill, his ideal may be called political democracy coupled with industrial liberty; and yet, as Mr. Wallas points out, he was something of a Socialist, since he was a land nationaliser and a neo-Malthusian. He was, as Mr. and Mrs. Sidney Webb truly say, "the most remarkable politician of his age." His industry was marvellous and his persistency extraordinary, and in popular and Parliamentary agitations he was an inventor and tactician of the first order. In educational schemes he was equally active; and the "Birkbeck," originally the London Mechanics' Institute, owes its existence chiefly to Place.

The latter portion of *The Life* deals with the Reform movement. Out of the disappointment at the only partial success of this movement sprang "the two most dramatic events of English working-class history"—the Grand National Trades Union of 1833-34, and the Chartist Movement of 1837-39, with the latter of which, perhaps, Place's name is most commonly identified. The last public affair of great importance in which he took part was the repeal of the Corn Laws, together with Cobden and the late C. P. Villiers; and in 1854 he passed painlessly away, his death attracting little public attention.

It is of interest to learn that Place was one of the early contributors to the WESTMINSTER REVIEW, then recently founded, in 1824, by Bentham and the two Mills. His first article, however, a review of a "History of Egypt," was, as Mr. Wallas says, "inexpressibly dull and wooden"; and his second, on the "History of Parliaments," simply unreadable. It is clear Place lacked literary skill, although that he could write, and write well, is equally clear from the letters and extracts given by Mr. Wallas.

It is scarcely necessary to add that much fresh light on the social, economic, and political events of English history between 1789 and 1846 is thrown by the publication of this exceptionally able *Life* of one of the most distinguished politicians of the nineteenth century. Mr. Wallas has produced a work worthy in every respect of his theme, and a book which should be carefully studied by every practical politician as by every political thinker.

Alien Immigrants to England,¹ by Dr. W. Cunningham, is the

¹ *Alien Immigrants to England*. By W. Cunningham, D.D. With three Maps and seven Illustrations. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. New York: The Macmillan Company, Ltd. 1897.

third volume to appear of the "Social England Series," and it could not have been placed in more competent hands, for on social-economic questions Dr. Cunningham has long been an acknowledged authority. This series rests upon the conviction of the editor, Mr. Kenelm Cotes, "that it is possible to make a successful attempt to give an account, not merely of politics and wars, but also of religion, commerce, art, literature, law, science, agriculture, and all that follows from their inclusion,"—to understand, in fact, how the masses lived, what they really cared for, and what they thought.

Dr. Cunningham not only tells us whence the aliens sprang and who they were, but where settled in this country, and their social, economic, and political effect. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries came the Flemish mercenaries, who settled down into craftsmen, such as masons and weavers; in the next two centuries aliens came from all parts of Europe, headed by Jews and Lombards, who alone at that time possessed a knowledge of finance. With the Reformation came the religious refugees, Walloon weavers, silk-weavers from France, glaziers from the Low Countries, printers from Germany. With the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes came crowds of Huguenots, and France's economic loss was England's gain. The Naturalisation Act of Anne resulted in a large incursion of destitute aliens from the Palatines, which, however, appears to have been not an unmixed blessing. And lastly, the breaking out of the great French Revolution was the signal for the immediate flight of the *émigrés* to these hospitable shores. This book is a commentary on De Foe's *True Born Englishman*. It shows us what we owe to aliens, and should do something towards lessening our insular contempt for foreigners.

Ignorance: A Study of the Causes and Effects of Popular Thought,¹ by Mr. Marcus R. P. Dorman, is ostensibly somewhat similar in its aim to *The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind*, by M. Gustave Le Bon. "The object of the present work," says Mr. Dorman, "is to state as briefly as possible the causes and results of ignorance in the past, the dangers of the present, and to advocate some educational reforms which would probably lead to greater knowledge, more equable emotions, and better balanced minds." And whereas Mr. Dorman works from the ignorance of the individual to the ignorance of the crowd, M. Le Bon starts with the mental inferiority of the crowd, shows its special characteristics and its distinction from the ignorance of the individual. This latter point of the mental inferiority of the crowd is not very clearly put by

¹ *Ignorance: A Study of the Causes and Effects of Popular Thought.* With some Educational Suggestions. By Marcus R. P. Dorman, M.A., M.B. Cantab. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd. 1898.

Mr. Dorman, although his argument comes to the same conclusion. He seeks to show "how the mind may be developed in any one direction to such an extent that the whole thoughts of the individual become biassed in order to show that the opinions of the majority are usually largely formed by their predominant emotion." He hardly, however, makes it clear that an individual in a crowd acts as he would never do as individual by himself. The part played by a crowd is almost invariably unconscious, and although this is also largely the case with the individual, yet the latter does to some extent consult his reason.

Both writers go to recent historical events for examples of the more prominent follies committed by large bodies of individuals. Mr. Dorman is careful to admit that opinions upon such examples necessarily differ. For instance, every one will not agree with Mr. Dorman that the Armenian agitation was irrational in seeking to put pressure upon the Sultan. Again, some of Mr. Dorman's ideas on political economy are of the very crudest. The unearned increment, he states, comes out of no individual's pocket and robs no man; it is true, he adds, that ground rents increase without any distinct effort of the landlord; but no one loses! We fancy the rack-rented and highly-rated occupier, who has created the increase of value and then has to pay a proportionally higher rent on the increased value, would hold a very different opinion.

If Mr. Dorman had read M. Gustave Le Bon as he ought to have done, and had been content to follow his methods, he might have been more successful. Where M. Le Bon is scientific, Mr. Dorman is merely empirical, and mere declamation unsubstantiated by reason only serves to irritate. No one can be omniscient; but even a universal genius, if such existed, could scarcely write with more assurance on every conceivable subject than Mr. Dorman. And to write a book on the ignorance of others requires a stronger philosophic judgment and a wider knowledge than we fear Mr. Dorman possesses. There is much, of course, in the book with which we are in accord, but, taken as a whole, it has no scientific value. Mr. Dorman himself has yet to learn the elementary principles of the science of ignorance and the psychology of the crowd.

In *A Handbook of Public International Law*,¹ by Mr. T. J. Lawrence, we have one of the very best epitomes and guides to the principles of this branch of jurisprudence that we can call to mind. For examination purposes, as we know from our own experience, it is simply invaluable. This is the fourth edition, and Mr. Lawrence

¹ *A Handbook of Public International Law*. By T. J. Lawrence, M.A., LL.D. Fourth edition. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. New York: The Macmillan Company, Ltd. 1898.

based his larger work, the *Principles of International Law*, upon the third edition.

We should feel more respect for *Every Man's Own Lawyer* (1898)¹ if the publishers would only cease to place on the cover the absurd and misleading allegations of "No more Lawyers' Bills," and "Six and Eightpence saved at every Consultation." As a brief epitome of English law this book is extremely valuable to the layman in giving him a general idea of his legal rights and duties; but beyond this it is apt to be dangerous. For a man unskilled in legal phraseology and legal principles to act as his own legal adviser is the height of folly. As the old saying goes, "he has a fool for his client."

PAMPHLETS.—In *Impressions D'Orient*² the writer, who we are given to understand is Comte R. D'Oyley, while giving a summary of those established facts which have marked the last twenty years of the history of Greece and Turkey, travels into the regions of high politics, and seeks to explain these facts in a way that Englishmen, at least, will find difficult to understand. Behind all the aspirations of Greece he sees the hand of England. A native of a country which boasts of its sympathy for Hellenic ambition, he shows no sign of commiseration for the misfortunes of the Greek people. To him the Greeks, Armenians, Macedonians, and others who have in any way attempted to oust the Turk are the puppets of England—that "much assuming nation" against whose "secret and underhand policy Europe is always knocking itself." It is England who fomented the Armenian disturbances, who allows the Greeks to land men and munitions of war in Crete, and who brought about the international control in that island as a first step to the possession of Suda Bay, which she has long coveted.

These gibes we need scarcely say are not fresh—in fact, they are so stale and so notoriously discredited that to dish them up afresh can serve no possible purpose save to create bad feeling between two great and friendly Powers.

¹ *Every Man's Own Lawyer*. By a Barrister. Thirty-fifth edition, carefully revised, including the legislation of 1897. To which is added a concise Dictionary of Legal Terms. London: Crosby Lockwood & Son. 1898.

² *Impressions D'Orient*. Coup D'Œil Historique. Paris: Boullay. 1898.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE story of the Third Napoleon's life¹ is "stranger than fiction." Mr. Archibald Forbes has carefully collected all the facts of Napoleon III.'s career, and has omitted nothing that throws light on this strange man's history. Hortense, Queen of Holland, the daughter of Josephine, the first wife of Napoleon the Great, was the mother of Louis Napoleon. She was an erring wife, but a devoted and heroic mother. Perhaps her maternal tenderness and self-sacrifice atoned for her frailties. Louis Bonaparte, King of Holland, whom Josephine designed as a husband for her daughter, was nine years younger than Napoleon. He was a good and brave soldier, but had no military ambition. In the attack at Saorgio he placed himself in front of his brother to protect him from hostile bullets. The Emperor, writing from St. Helena, said his courage was "brilliant, but by fits," and added "that he remained indifferent to the praises which his valour stimulated." It appears that he preferred to converse with *savants* rather than with soldiers. Such was the father of the Third Napoleon—if, indeed, another person could not claim the paternity, Admiral Verhuel, who certainly had been Hortense's lover, even after her marriage with the King of Holland. The future Napoleon III. spent his childhood at Malmaison. In *Souvenirs de ma Vie*, a fragment of uncompleted autobiography, he wrote: "I can still see the Empress Josephine at Malmaison covering me with her caresses." Louis Napoleon was scarcely six years old when the fortunes of the great Emperor suffered great reverses. In the early summer of 1813, wounded and broken soldiers who had survived the Russian campaign were seen in the streets of Paris. The Emperor urged upon Hortense to reopen the doors of her *salons*. She tried to stimulate gaiety, but it was forced and hollow. When Napoleon left Paris in 1813 she retired to St. Leu, where she lived with her children in retirement. When in the disastrous close of the campaign of 1814 the enemy were at the gates of Paris, Hortense maintained her courage and defended her children. She had hurried to the Tuileries to tell Maria Louise not to quit Paris. The Empress disregarded Hortense's advice. Hortense resolved to stay with the Parisians and share their fortunes. Her life was in danger from the Cossacks, but at Malmaison she managed to obtain an escort from a French cavalry officer, and arrived in safety at the château of Louis, whose owner had invited her to pass the night there. The great dread of Hortense was lest she should lose her children. Josephine died at Malmaison on May 29, 1814, her last words being "Bonaparte—Elba—Marie

¹ *The Life of Napoleon the Third.* By Archibald Forbes, LL.D. London: Chatto & Windus.

Louise." After her mother's funeral, Hortense retired with her children to St. Leu till the return of Napoleon from Elba. It was at this time that her husband, who was living in Rome, called on her to give up her two sons to him. Hortense contested his claim. The Court held that the elder boy should join his father. She had still another son—Louis, the future Napoleon III. After the fall of the Emperor, she received peremptory orders to fly from Paris, as she was supposed to be concerned in a plot for the assassination of all the foreign princes in Paris. The courtesy of Prince Schwarzenberg provided her with an escort. She had great difficulty in getting out of France safely. At length she reached Geneva, only to be ordered away at a day's notice. Aix, in Savoy, was more hospitable, and she stayed there for some time. From Aix she went to Constance, where she settled, and devoted herself to her son's education. Louis was a slow learner in his childhood. After the completion of his civilian education he adopted the military career. The insurrection in the Papal States encouraged the aspiration that the Bonaparte family, though exiled from France, might build for itself an empire beyond the Alps. The sons of Hortense fought under the standard of Young Italy. Hortense, who was anxious about them, quitted Florence with a British passport in the name of an English lady in March 1831. On her way to Forlì she was informed that her eldest son was dangerously ill; at Pesaro she found that he was dead. The blow was terrible. It nearly killed her. The news that the Austrian troops were in sight roused her from her unconsciousness. She felt that one son was left her, and resolved that she would save him at any cost. She used the English passport, and passed off a young nobleman, the Marquis of Zappi, as her lost son, of whose death her enemies were ignorant. Meanwhile Louis, too, fell sick. In this dilemma Hortense caused a berth to be taken for him in a vessel sailing for Corfu, and procured for him a passport for that port signed by the authorities of Ancona. The Austrian general was good enough to furnish her with a pass through his lines. When she reached the Tuscan frontier she became very anxious and apprehensive. Louis and his brother had been familiar figures in Tuscany. They passed the frontier at dead of night. The Commissioner of Police *visé*d the passport on the assurance of Hortense's courier that Prince Louis was not amongst the party. At Camoscia no relays of horses could be obtained; the inn was full. Hortense waited in her carriage in the street, while the Prince, in the dress of a flunkey, slept on a stone bench in the open air till horses were got.

The subsequent adventures of Louis Napoleon were equally exciting. He and his mother found refuge in England, where they met Talleyrand, who wanted to know the object of their visit. The reply was that they were on their way to Switzerland by way of Belgium,

and we are informed that this answer threw the diplomatic world into commotion. They soon afterwards left England for Arenenberg. The Prince became a Swiss citizen, and wrote in retirement his *Political Reflections*. Then came his attempt on Strasburg, and his imprisonment in Ham, from which he escaped. On October 5, 1837, his mother, the frail but brave and loving Hortense, died at the Château of Arenenberg, her last act being a feeble attempt to clasp him in her arms. In 1838 the Prince conceived the rather wild project of getting up a rising at Boulogne. The incident turned out a *fiasco*. Louis Philippe's Government put Louis Napoleon and his adherents on trial. When called on by the Court, the Prince read an interesting statement, in which he strongly urged his claims on France. He was condemned, and sentenced to perpetual imprisonment in a French fortress. His followers were sentenced to various terms of imprisonment. He got away from the prison, leaving a stuffed figure in his stead. He made his way to England, and, after a short residence in London, he went over to Paris. He was elected for three Departments, and was returned by the votes of the small owners and manufacturers as President of the Republic. Next came the *Coup d'État*, which is a matter of history. The remainder of Mr. Forbes's interesting volume is concerned with Napoleon III.'s career as Emperor of the French, his reign, and downfall after the catastrophe of Sedan. Paris owed him much for the manner in which he beautified it; but the close of his career was ignoble. Mr. Forbes's book, which is one of the most charmingly written specimens of biography we have ever seen, will be read with delight by a large circle of readers.

The Story of Hawaii,¹ by Jean A. Owen (Mrs. Visger), contains much valuable information on a subject concerning which too much ignorance prevails. Hawaii and other islands have often been vaguely designated as the South Sea Islands. There are eight islands, of which Hawaii is the largest, though Honolulu, the capital, is on the island of Oahii. Hawaii has an area of 4210 square miles, and its mountains rise to an elevation of 13,805 feet above the sea. Hilo is a rapidly growing town in Hawaii. It has a most beautiful bay. North-west of the island of Hawaii is Maui, with its lovely valley of Lao and the great crater of Haleakala, the largest extinct crater in the world. Another island, Molokai, is celebrated as the place to which lepers are sent. Every one has heard or read of Father Damien's labours amongst these lepers, and his heroic self-sacrifice. The author gives an interesting account of the origin of the Hawaiians, which is rather obscure, the tradition being that one Wakea—who in the Marquesas and Hervey Islands is the God

¹ *The Story of Hawaii*. By Jean A. Owen (Mrs. Visger). London and New York: Harper and Brothers.

of Light—with his wife Papa, were the founders of the race. The Maoris say that their ancestors came from Hawaiki, which is only a variation of the word Hawaii. The history of the kings of Hawaii is rather exciting, as the people appear to exhibit violent revolutionary tendencies. To-day Hawaii disputes with Japan the claim to be called "the children's Paradise." The young people of Hawaii are constantly in the open air, bathing, as it were, in the sunlight. It is a beautiful, picturesque, and enjoyable island. Mrs. Visger's book practically exhausts the subject, and it will repay perusal.

The fourth volume of Adolf Hohn's *History of Greece*¹ concludes the work. It deals with the Græco-Macedonian period, the period of the Kings and of the Leagues, from the death of Alexander up to the incorporation of the last Macedonian monarchy in the Roman Empire. This volume deals with a considerable portion of the history of civilisation. The chapters dealing with the Ptolemies, the war between Rome and Carthage, Athenian art, and the Roman dramatists are intensely interesting. The author's notes display immense research. Mr. Clarke's translation is excellent.

In *The Gladstone Colony*,² Mr. J. F. Hogan, M.P., tells the history of a very interesting experiment in the treatment of transported convicts, in which Mr. Gladstone, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, was concerned. At the time—1845—Van Diemen's Land had become flooded with the convict element; and Mr. Gladstone conceived the idea of lessening the number of convicts annually sent to that island by selecting a limited proportion of them to supply the labour market in New South Wales. Mr. Hogan relates in his book the history of this experiment. The colony did not succeed in securing a permanent place on the map, but its intended metropolis, Gladstone, still exists, and retains the name of its founder to this very hour. The volume extends beyond the limits of a mere narrative of this colonising experiment; it presents a full and comprehensive survey of Mr. Gladstone's political connection with the colonies. We must congratulate Mr. Hogan on having written a very readable book.

Stewart Clarke, One of Nature's Noblemen, by S. E. S. C., is one of those eulogistic biographies whose gushing character must, perhaps, be excused on natural grounds. The subject of the biography was a good but commonplace man. Every man is a hero in the eyes of a loving wife, though every man is not a hero to his valet. This may be in accordance with the fitness of things; but for the purposes of artistic truth it is rather an unfortunate foible in human nature.

¹ *The History of Greece, from the Commencement to the Close of the Independence of the Greek Nation*. By Adolph Hohn. Translated from the German by Frederick Clarke. Vol. IV. The Græco-Macedonian Age. London: Macmillan & Co.

² *The Gladstone Colony: An Unwritten Chapter of Australian History*. By J. F. Hogan, M.P. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

BELLES LETTRES.

EVERY admirer of Thackeray—and the name of his admirers is legion—will read the volume entitled *Thackerayana*¹ with delight. We cannot say that the book does justice to the great novelist. It is scrappy, and even, from a biographical point of view, very imperfect. However, it has many attractive features, and the sketches by Thackeray himself are very characteristic. The pictures of the exciting portions in *The Castle of Otranto* are exceedingly funny. That ponderous work, Rollin's *Ancient History*, also furnished Thackeray with materials for pictorial caricature. We learn that Thackeray's favourite novelist was Fielding, whose *Tom Jones* and *Joseph Andrews* appeared to him the greatest masterpieces of English fiction. Some of Thackeray's illustrations of Fielding are very good. The importance of this volume is that it throws light on Thackeray's tastes as a reader and as a lover of books. Who would not like to see the books that the author of *Vanity Fair* loved?

The name of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus² is familiar to every student of the Stoic philosophy. His *Thoughts* have a perennial interest for the moralist and the student of human nature. There are many English translations of Marcus Aurelius, from that of Meric Casaubon in 1634 to that of George Long, which first appeared in 1862. Jeremy Collier has produced a rather free version; and the Foulis Press edition, by James Moor and Francis Hutcheson, possessed considerable merit. The new translation by Dr. Gerald H. Rendall is admirably done. The introductory study of Stoicism shows a thorough knowledge of the subject. Stoicism must ever be interesting to all who wish to trace the growth of Pagan philosophy. In many respects Stoicism has supplied inspiration to the pioneers of Christianity, and its tenets bear some resemblance to the ideas that underlie Christian asceticism. We need not follow Dr. Rendall in his luminous history of early Greek philosophy, wherein he shows how Stoicism derived its descent from Socrates through Cynic ethics and Megarian logic. The subject is handled with ease, and at the same time with erudition, and the large portion of the volume occupied by the Introduction will be regarded by students as exceptionally interesting. There is also a good account of Marcus Aurelius himself, who is described as "perhaps the loftiest exemplar of unassisted duty whom history records—unalterably loyal to the noblest hypothesis of life he

¹ *Thackerayana*. Illustrated by hundreds of Sketches. By William Makepeace Thackeray. London: Chatto & Windus.

² *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to Himself*. An English translation, with Introductory Study on Stoicism and the Last of the Stoics. By Gerald H. Rendall, M.A., Litt.D. London: Macmillan & Co.

knew." Life, to this Imperial philosopher, was "more like wrestling than dancing," yet "in his patience he won his soul." *Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to Himself* is the title of the work, of which a clear and excellent translation is given. There are passages of great wisdom and beauty in this work—indeed, it surpasses, in many respects, the writings of Solomon. For instance, take this fine passage:—"Do not waste what is left of life in regarding other men, except when bent upon some unselfish gain. Why miss opportunities for action by thus persistently regarding what so-and-so is doing and why, what he is saying or thinking or planning, or anything else that dazes and distracts you from allegiance to your inner self? In the sequence of your regards shun wayward random thoughts, and, above all, meddling and ill-nature; limit yourself habitually to such regards that, if suddenly asked, 'What is in your thoughts now?' you could tell at once the candid and unhesitating truth—a direct plain proof that all your thoughts were simple and in charity, such as befit a social being, who eschews voluptuous or even self-indulgent fancies, or jealousy of any kind, or malice and suspicion, or any other mood which you would blush to own."

If there is any weakness in the philosophy of Marcus Aurelius, it is its tendency towards passivity and complete resignation to Destiny. A more vigorous code would enjoin ceaseless and unyielding conflict with the cruelty of untoward circumstances, and an unconquerable determination not to recognise injustice in any form, but rather to die fighting in the cause of right. Marcus Aurelius scarcely understood the active heroism which is the practical outcome of modern ideas. But he was a true philosopher and a good man in his own day, and his work will remain a permanent contribution to the literature of the world.

Svend Bidevind,¹ by Bernt Lie, is a specimen of Norwegian story-telling. The book is nicely brought out and may interest students of Ibsen like Mr. William Archer. It might be worth translating.

Who would imagine that Walt Whitman's poetry would find a minute and painstaking critic in an Italian? Yet so it is. We have received a volume entitled *La Poesià di Walt Whitman*,² by Signor P. Jannaccone. The writer of this critical work endeavours to show that Whitman has evolved new rhythmic forms in his poems, and quotes passages from "Leaves of Grass," to sustain this view. The appearance of such a work as this proves that the brotherhood of literature is a world-embracing bond.

*John Armstrong*³ is a story which opens in Norwich, and after—

¹ *Svend Bidevind*. By H. Bernt Lie. Kristiania: Aschehong & Co.

² *La Poesià di Walt Whitman*. By P. Jannaccone. Torino: Roux, Frassati & Co.

³ *John Armstrong*. By Major Greenwood. London: Digby, Long & Co.

wards brings us to the banks of the Hoogley. It is a tale in which "things go wrong," and somehow matters are patched up in the end. Major Greenwood, M.D., LL.B., has not yet learned the art of writing a story. We would much prefer to hear him tell this "story of a life" by the fireside under the genial influence of a glass of champagne and a cigar than to read his book, which is rather heavy.

*Longer Flights*¹ is luckily not a work of fiction, but a volume of essays. It is easier to read a tolerable collection of essays than an illustrated and stupid novel. Mrs. Alexander Ireland is the biographer of *Jane Welch Carlyle*, and she knows how to write. We think the essay on "Letters and Letter-writing" the most interesting in the book. The essay on "Novels with a Purpose" contains no very original views on that much-discussed subject. We wish the injudicious article "On Certain Old Love-Letters," with its fatuous attack on Swift, had been left unwritten.

*Across Country*² is a "sporting romance." We have read it and found it very dull; though it is evident that the author honestly intended to be amusing. The scene of part of the story is in Buluwayo, and this may interest the class of readers who hail with delight any reference to that attractive though distant spot.

A Girl Bejant,³ by J. K. Campbell, is a short sketch of St. Andrews' University. It is rather spirited, and has many features of interest.

*The Nineteenth Century in France*⁴ is the title of a volume of selections from the best modern French writers. In the first volume of the work selections are given from Lamartine, Hugo, and Musset.

*Philip Greystones*⁵ is one of those weak efforts which show that the capacity for writing fiction is not very widespread. The story is ill-constructed and the style is crude.

*Queens and Knaves*⁶ is described as "a novel." We could discover very little novelty in it. It is a sort of unconnected story, which spasmodically struggles to be amusing, and fails. It would have been better for the writer of this book to read some of the best fiction instead of adding to the enormous mass of bad fiction.

¹ *Longer Flights*. Recollections and Studies. By Mrs. Alexander Ireland. London: Digby, Long & Co.

² *Across Country*. A Sporting Romance. By John Gilbert. London: Digby, Long & Co.

³ *A Girl Bejant*. By J. K. Campbell. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁴ *The Nineteenth Century in France*. Vol. I. Lamartine; Hugo; Musset. By Paul Chauvel, B.A. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁵ *Philip Greystones*. By Eva May. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁶ *Queens and Knaves*. A novel. By Cella Nash. London: Digby, Long & Co.

POETRY.

The Unnamed Lake, and Other Poems,¹ by Frederick G. Scott, is above rather than below the average. There is some real poetic feeling in this little volume. We like "A Dream of the Prehistoric." We may quote a passage :

"Enfolded in darkness for ever, untouched by the changes above,
And mingled as day with the day which the hands of the ages had
brought,
Were the hearts in whose furnace of anguish was melted the gold of
our love,
And the brains from whose twilight of instinct has risen the dawn of
our thought."

Alamo, and Other Verses,² cannot be ranked very high as poetry. Still, there is force and manly vigour in many of these verses. The opening lines "To America" have the true ring, and they sound the keynote of sympathy between the Great Republic and the Mother Country. The lines headed "Rio Pecos" (Pecos River) have a pleasant tilt, and give a vivid idea of the days of Indian raids. The author has a certain soldierly dash and daring which will appeal to many hearts. We understand that the proceeds of the sale of the little volume are to be applied in defraying the expenses of a Free Circulating Library and Literary Institute at Florence, New Mexico. We hope the book will succeed in effecting this praiseworthy object.

Under the title of *Hora Novissima*,³ Charles Lawrence Ford, M.A., has presented us with a metrical version of the first book of Bernard de Morlaix's celebrated Latin poem entitled *De Contemptu Mundi*. The text is appended; and we can scarcely acknowledge that the version given is a translation in the real sense. It certainly imitates the original rather cleverly, and gives the sense approximately for the most part. The book may be regarded as an interesting curiosity.

¹ *The Unnamed Lake, and Other Poems*. By Frederic George Scott. Toronto : William Briggs.

² *Alamo, and Other Verses*. Florence, New Mexico : G. McQueen Gray.

³ *Hora Novissima*. A Metrical Version of some portions of the Latin Poem by Bernard de Morlaix entitled *De Contemptu Mundi*. By C. L. Ford, M.A. London : Houston & Son.

ART.

A BOOK worth compiling for reasons artistic as well as patriotic is *The Glasgow School of Painting*.¹ The head master of the Glasgow School of Art explains why and how the painters centring in the city by the Clyde have taken part in a renaissance, which has become a movement, and resulted in a school of painting which has made for itself a "strong, self-reliant, commanding position. National temperament decided its form and local influences moulded its outcome." Fifty-eight paintings from twenty-four artists, reproduced from photographs direct from the canvas on full-page inset plates, are interleaved with suitable biographies and text in a handsomely printed volume. The plates show perhaps better than more ambitious engravings might have done the tonality which is characteristic of many modern schools of painting. The letterpress is interesting to all those who care to know what is going on in native art work, and the Introduction, even if slightly wanting in due perspective, is suggestive of profitable thought.

Why should there not be a Glasgow Renaissance? It depends only on the number of patrons who are willing to train their eyes, and then to take the time to look upon things that are beautiful. Things are beautiful if they please when seen—the pleasure of a contemplative faculty, intellectual but based on sense impressions. Where the senses are common and unrefined by practice, and the intellect is preoccupied with other things than pleasure from what is beautiful, Art—no matter with how large a capital we write it—is impossible as anything more than a perfunctory fashion. This, it seems, is no longer the condition of things in Glasgow, and this book goes far to prove it. The names of some of these painters are well known to frequenters of exhibitions. Lavery, for instance, has a reputation which extends far beyond the island of Great Britain.

The appearance of a suitable record of the life and works of *Thomas Gainsborough*² is worthy of more than passing attention. The writer has shown due industry in compiling the facts of a career that touched at nearly every point of English history of the latter half of the eighteenth century. Even by a stretch of probability which is not always so appropriate in recent historical work, the likely associations of the painter with the great men of the day are fully described. The result is a book of twofold interest—that of our higher national art and that of our social evolution in a period

¹ *The Glasgow School of Painting*. By David Martin. With an Introduction by Francis H. Newbery. London: George Bell & Sons. 1897.

² *Thomas Gainsborough*. A Record of his Life and Works. By Mrs. Arthur Bell (N. d'Anvers). With Illustrations, reproduced for the most part direct from the original paintings. London: George Bell & Sons. 1897.

preceding violent mental revolutions and the material growths of the nineteenth century.

The art work alone concerns us here; but even this is of more than æsthetic interest, for it involves the growing conviction of some Englishmen that their tight little island may, after all, have had something great as well as original in the art production of the world. Sir Joshua Reynolds, with due humility, did not expect English art-patrons to pay as much for his native work as for the facile compositions of foreign masters fresh from Italy. Now, even in foreign criticism, the Italians of that day are forgotten, while Frenchmen and Germans have long since discovered Reynolds and Gainsborough.

The large quarto volume with six handsome photogravure plates and sixty-three direct reproductions from paintings and the painter's own engravings, is an excellent sample of the art-books of which no library can have too many. The text, with its full index of names, follows interestingly the career of this English master from his birth in 1727 to his present immortality.

Messrs. Bell's Cathedral series of monographs, planned to supply visitors to the great English Cathedrals with accurate and well illustrated guide-books at a popular price (1s. 6d.), reaches *Winchester* with the eighth volume.¹ Since its publication three others have appeared and sixteen more are announced. The idea is excellent and is likely to benefit many who are unable to visit the cathedrals in person. Each volume is a summary in its own way of a local art and church history. Thus the present volume gives in six chapters the history of the cathedral; the description of the cathedral building and close from the exterior; the interior, nave, choir, reredos, transepts, feretory, chapels, crypts, and stained glass; the history of the See; the Bishops of Winchester; and other institutions connected with the cathedral. There are forty-five illustrations well chosen and printed, and there are two good plans of cathedral and crypts.

We may add one curious footnote which is not without a reason in art. The Milner, who is several times quoted without further explanation or reference, was the Roman Catholic bishop *in partibus infidelium* who, in the last days of the penal laws against his kind, occupied his leisure in writing *The End of Controversy*, that began so much disputing in this century, and—what is more to our purpose—was one of the first to study with some sympathy and intelligence the "Pointed style" of architecture in the Gothic monuments of Winchester. He deserves some slight remembrance

¹ *The Cathedral Church of Winchester. A Description of its Fabric and a brief History of the Episcopal See.* By Philip W. Sergeant. London: George Bell & Sons. 1898.

as a forerunner of the violent Gothicism of Pugin and others later on. The latter, like true neophytes, naturally took their mediæval fever of architecture and religion much harder.

The reviewer has kept lying on his table for some time the third volume of a work of which he had hopes of seeing the first and second. Without further delay it should be said that the work, the publication of which seems to have been secured by subscription, is of very considerable importance to all who are interested in *Painters and their Works*.¹ It is in the form of a dictionary in the alphabetical order of the painters' names—in the present volume, from Sabbatini to Zyl. There is a lengthy appendix of "imitators and copyists," and another of eighty-four pages (and thirteen pages of special index) of *facsimile* signatures and marks. The details are brought down to the death of Millais and the sales of 1897. To show the method of the work and its importance, let us take the single article devoted to Titian. Four pages are given to a readable and full account of his life and career as a painter; and four more give the pictures and prices at auction sales from 1768 to 1892. In the appendix three of his signatures are given in *facsimile*. The same method is applied to Velasquez, to Troyon, to George Richmond. It is idle to insist on the utility of such a work to all who are in any way interested in the Fine Art of Painting, if only as a matter of history or profitable conversation. The work seems to have been done with judgment and conscientious attention to accuracy in detail. The volume in our possession has something over 600 pages, well printed and bound handsomely and conveniently.

¹ *Painters and their Works*. A Dictionary of great Artists who are not now alive, giving their Names, Lives, and the Prices paid for their Works at auctions. By Ralph N. James. London: Upcott Gill. 1897.

Anglo-Dutch, Italian, French, and other instances from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. The letterpress is brief, clear, and in the order of the plates. These are photo-lithographed from the author's drawings. They are precise in detail, and showy enough to please the amateur. They are provided with all the necessary indications apart from the letterpress, which adds interesting items concerning prices paid at sales and the present whereabouts of the examples.

To the student of art history—the art history of the English people, which has not yet found its Green to present it lucidly—this volume is a step forward towards the popularising of our national art. There is still a confusing irregularity in the naming of the periods, although these are fairly distinct and concordant with political history. It should be possible for a classifying mind to do for England what has long since been done for France—to limit the too great extension of Stuart styles, to define Jacobean and the rest, and to associate an exact art-name with the general reader's conception of life at any period of English history.

The Council of the Royal Institute of British Architects gave as the subject for the Essay Medal for 1896, *The Influence of Material on Architecture*;¹ the medal was awarded to the work of Mr. Banister F. Fletcher, who now publishes the essay in book form along with the illustrations. As might be expected from the *History of Comparative Architecture*, of which Mr. B. F. Fletcher was joint-author, the essay is full of the fundamental thought which must lie at the base of all art history.

“Architecture is an affair of material, the true use or needs of which mould the style, which is created out of the qualities of the materials that have to be employed.” This fertile principle (which, of course, must be limited to the building art) bases the division of the work. In successive chapters are treated, summarily but interestingly: Egypt, mud and reeds to granite; Assyria, mud to brick, or wood to stone; Greece, timber to stone and marble; Rome, stone and marble to brickwork and concrete; Romanesque, a period of destruction and upheaval; the Renaissance period, with its style largely independent of the influence of material (does not this enter into all Renaissance movements, which are distinctive chiefly in their mental part?); and Modern Architecture, a mixed period, the age of iron and steel.

The last chapter, with its examples from the Paris and Chicago Exhibitions, is of timely interest and importance. “Architecture, divorced from its true motive power, now known as engineering, but which in all previous periods has been a part of it, ceases to aim at anything more than the production of forms more and more losing

¹ *The Influence of Material on Architecture*, By Banister F. Fletcher. London: B. T. Batsford. 1897.

their significance, because they are not renewing their vitality by being referred to the true principles of construction, and if they are not soon quick to see their position, architects themselves will be reduced to the condition of mere decorative designers."

A book which enters into the general division of decorative art furniture is *The Raven*¹ (not by Edgar Allan Poe, but the child's story written in one of his *naïve* intervals by Coleridge), illustrated as naively and fantastically by Miss Ella Hallward, and introduced by the Hon. Stephen Coleridge. It forms a thin folio, with a white parchment binding, on which one of the characteristic designs is reproduced, with meandering lines of verse as letterpress on shining white pages opposite similar designs—the raven, the witch Melancholy, the swine

"That grunted as they crunched the mast :
For that was ripe and fell full fast,"

the lovers, the woodman, the shipwreck, with Death riding the storm to the raven's ill-boding call—all the consequence of the acorn which the raven had planted.

POETRY.

MR. ALFRED AUSTIN has published a little volume of poems, entitled *Songs of England*.² There is a note of overstrained patriotism running through them all. Perhaps the best poem in the book is "Look Seaward, Sentinel," in which occur the fine lines :

"I see a land of liberty and peace,
Ancient in glory and strength, but young in mien,
Like immemorial forest spring makes green,
And whose boughs broaden as the years increase."

This is like an echo of Tennyson ; and though his mantle has not fallen, in the accepted sense, on the present Poet Laureate, it is only a narrow-minded critic who would refuse to recognise in Mr. Austin a true poet.

Aarbert,³ by Mr. William Marshall, is a curious jumble of lyric and dramatic verse. Its object is evidently religious ; but it cannot rank high as poetry. The author has a weakness for old English words, which require to be explained by a glossary. We really fail to see any artistic reason for the publication of *Aarbert*.

¹ *The Raven*. A Poem. By Samuel Taylor Coleridge. Illustrated by Ella Hallward. London : H. S. Nichols, Ltd. 1898.

² *Songs of England*. By Alfred Austin, Poet Laureate. London : Macmillan and Co.

³ *Aarbert*. A Drama without Stage or Scenery, wrought out through Song in many moods, mostly Lyric. By William Marshall. London : Swan Sonnenschein.

THE
WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CXLIX. No. 5.—MAY 1898.

WANTED: AN IMPERIAL MINIMUM.

THE year 1896 will, in all probability, be noted by future historians as one of the turning-points in the history of the Anglo-Saxon race. From that year will be traced the first indications of a new tendency marking a fresh epoch in the eventful story of our people. The change has been so gradual that it has not yet been generally noticed by the bulk of the nation. Nevertheless it is of so revolutionary a character that the whole of our foreign policy must inevitably be re-adjusted in order to comply with the new order of things which is coming into existence. The race which for decades has expanded and spread itself over the world has apparently come to one of those periods in its history when the tide ceases to flow and a period of tranquillity follows years of restlessness. The emigrant, the type of the period of expansion, is replaced by the citizen, the symbol of the new era of consolidation. The multitudes which have streamed from our shores have already occupied most of the vacant lands of the earth. The English race has entered into possession of all the unclaimed lands of the world as if they belonged to it as a matter of right. Now the race shows signs that its land hunger is at last appeased, and that it will for years to come occupy itself rather with consolidating what it has already acquired than in increasing the vast extent of the Empire.

This fact is one of momentous importance, and necessitates a re-consideration of the whole of our policy in regard to other nations. If the new conditions are to be grappled with the old traditional policy will have to be dropped and a new one evolved. At the present moment we are standing at the parting of the ways. Those who have not read the signs of the times naturally cling to the old policy under which the Empire has grown and flourished. Those, on

the other hand, who have noted the changed conditions, endeavour to formulate a policy upon which they can rely in the troublous times which they see approaching. The natural result is much confusion of thought, which is not merely confined to the general public.

When the race was expanding, exploring new worlds, and settling unknown countries, the policy of the motherland was necessarily one of territorial aggression. Such a policy had as its inevitable corollary—a continual conflict with rival nations. It is solely owing to the pre-occupation in recent times of the European nations in domestic concerns that our expansion has not been paid for at the price of constant war. Thanks to the period of peace which followed the downfall of Napoleon, when most of the European nations were occupied in re-forming themselves upon a national basis, the English race has been able to build up its mighty fabric of Empire unmolested. In the last sixty years we have sketched out, as it were, the outlines of the dominion of the race; we have now to fill in the details.

As war goes hand in hand with expansion, so peace is no less the fitting companion of an era of consolidation and concentration. The colonies of English-speaking peoples scattered over the earth's surface require time to grow and develop their resources, and therefore the next fifty years will be the critical period in the history of the race and the Empire. Is the fair promise of Empire to be fulfilled, or is the work of the past to be an idle labour yielding naught? That question the present generation will probably see answered. Peace in which to consolidate is the first requisite of the Empire to-day. The immense responsibility of the risk of war has been keenly felt by all Ministers who, in recent years, have had charge of the foreign affairs of the nation. It weighs upon them with the haunting power of a nightmare. They are, as it were, groping blindly in the dark in the hope of discovering a firm foundation upon which they may rear a policy which will support them in their need. The Foreign Secretary of the present generation is a modern Atlas, carrying the world upon his shoulders, stumbling in the mire, unable to secure a sure footing for his feet. The natural result follows. Concessions are made which affect our vital interests, others, which in no way concern us, are haggled over as if the Empire were at stake. We do not know when to make small concessions gracefully, and at the same time are prone to make "graceful concessions" of great value without any equivalent return. The knowledge that it is possible to obtain such concessions is a continual invitation to our rivals to put forward all manner of claims. They do not risk much, and may gain greatly. The practical renunciation of all further territorial acquisitions has its advantages, but there are disadvantages. Our rivals, seeing their great competitor is satisfied,

will probably be all the more eager to scramble for what remains unappropriated.

Hence the pressing need of to-day is what may be described as an Imperial Minimum, which may serve as the guiding policy of the Empire. This minimum will need to be so formulated as to include all that is of vital interest to the welfare of the British Empire, and at the same time exclude all that does not directly affect our interests, political and commercial. Such an Imperial Minimum should be the standard by which all foreign questions could be tested. Until such a minimum is formulated it will be impossible for Great Britain to have a settled and consistent foreign policy, and without such a settled policy peace with honour and safety is impossible, and without peace the work of consolidation cannot be carried on. Thus we have an intricate problem in which the solution depends upon an undiscovered quantity.

For some years we have lived on a hand-to-mouth foreign policy which, although anything but brilliant, has, at any rate, afforded us some clue as to the lines along which the Imperial Minimum should be drawn. Our vital interests are twofold—(1) territorial; (2) commercial. With regard to the first there is not much difference of opinion. Every one agrees that the maintenance of the territorial *status quo* of the Empire is one of the vital interests of our people. That by common consent will come within the Imperial Minimum. With regard to the second vital interest opinions are more divided. Our commerce is not only co-extensive with our Empire, but overlaps it in all directions. Hence our interests in many places may be attacked with far greater safety than if they were protected by a territorial claim. It is on the knowledge of this fact that the policy of squeeze is based, and, owing to the absence of any definite policy in regard to our commercial interests outside the confines of the Empire, has largely succeeded. Therefore, if our vital strength is not to be frittered away in endless disputes we must discover a formula which will protect our commerce from the encroachment of foreign Powers, without at the same time interfering with their legitimate interests.

The danger we have to meet was clearly defined in a remarkable speech of Count Goluchowski, delivered last November. He said:

“A turning-point has been reached in European development. The destructive competition with the trans oceanic countries, which had partly to be carried on at present and was partly to be expected in the immediate future, required prompt and thorough counteracting measures if the vital interests of the peoples of Europe were not to be gravely compromised. They must fight shoulder to shoulder against the common danger, and must arm themselves for the struggle with all the means at their disposal. As the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had been absorbed by religious wars, and as the eighteenth century was distinguished by the triumphs of

Liberal ideas, and our own by the appearance of the nationality question—so the twentieth century would be for Europe a period marked by the struggle for existence in the politico-commercial sphere. European nations must close their ranks in order successfully to defend their existence."

The politico-commercial struggle has already begun, and the nations of Europe are endeavouring to perpetuate their existence by the feverish energy with which they are acquiring new territories and turning them into close preserves for their own trade. This policy has been pursued to such an extent in Africa that that continent has practically ceased to exist as a free market open to all nations on equal terms. The English policy has been the exact reverse. All new markets acquired by the British people have been thrown open to all the world on equal terms. It is one of our "vital interests" that the remaining free markets of the world shall not be monopolised for the trade of any one European Power, but shall remain open to all alike. Those who are affected by the Jingo madness cry aloud that Great Britain should guarantee the territorial integrity of these markets. Such a dog-in-the-manger policy is not only impracticable, but in that direction ruin and destruction lie. Nor is it to our interest to do so. European occupation develops a country and promotes trade, and inasmuch as this is the case we are the gainers. It is undesirable for us to administer already thickly peopled countries, but it is not for us to object if other nations wish to do so—on one condition. That condition is the maintenance of the commercial *status quo*. This is the formula which will enable us to protect our commerce and defend our interests if it is acted on consistently and energetically. The two points of our future foreign policy would therefore be :

1. No further territorial expansion.
2. The maintenance of the commercial *status quo*.

Our Free Trade policy and our predominant commercial interests in the markets of the world give us the moral right to insist that, no matter how the territorial *status quo* may be changed, the commercial *status quo* shall remain unchanged. Such a policy, further, would have the support of all the smaller commercial Powers who cannot embark upon colonial enterprises, and of the United States, which is as yet unwilling to do so. If once such a policy were adopted, we could watch the scramble for land among the European Powers with the utmost equanimity.

Mr. Balfour, speaking at Manchester on January 10, defined the policy of the "Open Door" in China as follows :

"Our interests there are commercial and trading interests, and are not territorial interests; and the first deduction I draw from that is that territory, in so far as it is not necessary to supply a base for possible warlike operations, is a disadvantage rather than an advantage. . . . We have a

special claim to see that the policy of that country is not directed towards the discouragement of that foreign trade."

Sir M. Hicks-Beach, speaking at Bristol on January 17, endorsed this view :

"What we wanted in China was not territorial acquisition. We thought of that country with no selfish interest. We desired to open it, and its hundreds of millions of toiling, patient, and hard-working people, to the benefit of the trade of the world. . . . We did not regard China as a place for conquest or acquisition by any other European or other Power. We looked upon it as the most hopeful place of the future for the commerce of our country and the commerce of the world at large, and the Government were absolutely determined, at whatever cost, even—and he wished to speak plainly—if necessary, at the cost of war, that that door should not be shut."

Here we have the germ of the policy of an Imperial Minimum which is not only applicable to China but also to all the other open markets of the world. Recent events have tended to immensely strengthen the policy of the commercial *status quo* as laid down by Ministers, while at the same time showing how impracticable a policy is that to which the House of Commons has committed itself in its resolution of March 1: "That it is of vital importance for British commerce and influence that the independence of Chinese territory should be maintained."

At present the great markets of the world which are open and unappropriated by any first-class Power are China, Siam, Persia, Asia Minor, and the States of South and Central America. In all these countries we have great commercial interests, and it is of vital importance to us that the present freedom of trade should be the minimum and not the maximum degree of liberty to be obtained. The proclamation of so novel a doctrine as that of the Open Trade Door throughout the world no doubt would meet with much opposition. But it is a policy which would command the adhesion of all the commercial Powers and would not really affect the interests of the colony-acquiring nations. Three Powers principally are following the policy of the "Closed Door." Germany and France are the greatest offenders in this respect, and Russia in a minor degree. The aim of our statesmen in the near future, in fact, at the present moment, should be to obtain a general international recognition of the Imperial commercial minimum. To us as the greatest of the trading nations belongs the initiative in this matter. No doubt we may run the risk at first of the chance of war, but we have the declaration of Ministers that they have foreseen that contingency and are prepared for it. The minimum of the commercial *status quo* is of vital interest to the Empire, and in fighting in such a cause we would be preserving the Imperial fabric from insidious but deadly attack. It is much easier to keep the door open than to open

it when shut. We had to open the closed doors of the New World with cannon in the days of Elizabeth, and it is possible that such a method may be necessary to keep the doors open in the reign of Victoria.

Although the policy of the Open Trade Door may need the aid of the cannon before it obtains general acceptance, it should not pass the wit of our statesmen to avoid this danger. If we look at the free markets of the world we shall find they all lie in two continents, Asia and America. Africa has already been partitioned and is no longer a free market—that is, open on equal terms to all nations. In both Asia and America Great Britain is one of the dominant territorial and commercial Powers, but our predominance in both cases is shared by another Power. The interests of the United States in America and those of Russia in Asia are equal to our own. Hence, if we could but arrive at any understanding with these Powers there would not be much difficulty in imposing the policy of the Open Trade Door upon both France and Germany. An understanding of this description practically exists between Great Britain and the United States at the present time. The interests of the two nations in this respect are identical. The United States has already formulated a minimum of her own in the Monroe doctrine, which goes as far as placing a veto upon any European territorial extension in the New World. The maintenance of the Monroe doctrine is one of the guiding principles of its foreign policy. The freedom of the markets of the New World are secured as long as the Monroe doctrine is not infringed. Obviously the proper course for Great Britain is to frankly accept the Monroe doctrine and adopt it as part of her own foreign policy. In the first instance it was approved and accepted by an English Minister, and it would be only fitting that it should to-day receive our support. In the present condition of affairs, when there seems to be a probability that the Monroe doctrine may be called in question, if not infringed, by certain European Powers, it is also to the advantage of the United States to frankly recognise that our interests and her own are the same in this question. If the Monroe doctrine, as enunciated by President Monroe, is to be maintained in the face of expanding European Powers, it will have to receive the support of the two countries whose interests—territorial, political, and commercial—are paramount in the New World. The advice of Thomas Jefferson, the drafter of the Declaration of Independence, is as enlightened to-day as it was in 1823. "Great Britain," he said, "is the nation that can do us the most harm of any one, or all, on earth: and with her on our side we need not fear the Old World. With her we should most sedulously cherish a cordial friendship."

In the New World it may be possible to maintain not only the commercial but also the territorial *status quo*, but in Asia this is

not possible. In that continent England and Russia are the two Powers which have the greatest interests at stake. An understanding between them may be somewhat difficult to bring about, owing to the unreasoning panic which fills the Russophobes in this country whenever the name of Russia is mentioned. If, instead of blindly denouncing Russia and all things Russian, we were to endeavour to understand their point of view, there would not be much difficulty in arriving at a mutual understanding which would secure to us all our vital commercial interests. But before such an understanding could be brought about we must recognise that Russia has legitimate aims in Asia which she has every right to carry out. If this were done frankly and freely, Russia would raise no objection to the recognition of the Open Trade Door in Asia.

Of the two understandings that with Russia is more pressing, as the market of China is in the greatest peril. If England and Russia were to agree to work side by side on a mutual and satisfactory basis, Germany and France would have no alternative but to follow suit, and accept the Open Trade Door with as good a grace as might be. The traditional policy of Germany has been to play off England against Russia, and when these two Powers are busy quarrelling she has quietly secured her own objects. Unfortunately such a policy is one which it is only too easy to pursue. But it is Germany and not Russia which is encroaching upon our commercial supremacy. We allow with calmness the former to seize a port while we work ourselves into a state bordering on panic when Russia obtains what our Ministers have recognised her perfect right to—an ice-free port. If our interests are to be protected, and the Open Trade Door is to be a reality in Asia, it will have to be in co-operation with and not in defiance of Russia. The most strenuous endeavours of English statesmen should be engaged in bringing about a cordial *entente* with Russia and the United States, which would leave us free to check any Power, presuming upon our reluctance to fight, which trespasses upon ground recognised as lying within the Imperial Minimum.

W. S.

THOMAS LOVELL BEDDOES:

"A FORGOTTEN OXFORD POET."

THE name of Thomas Lovell Beddoes is not very familiar to the average student of English literature. More than forty-eight years have passed since his death, and were it not for the zealous efforts of some appreciative friends to save his memory from oblivion, he would now probably be, in the literal sense of the word, altogether forgotten. That he deserves to be remembered, both on account of his remarkable qualities as a man and his exceptional gifts as a poet, no impartial critic can deny. No doubt his genius, like his personality, had certain morbid characteristics; but literature must deal with the abnormal as well as with the normal, its wide field covering all the products of man's intellect and imagination. Poe and Baudelaire are interesting, in spite of their essential unhealthiness. We may condemn their faults as men; we cannot ignore their work as poets. So it is with Beddoes. He, indeed, has been as unfortunate in his relationship to the generation of readers which sprang up after his death as he was with regard to his contemporaries, who should have known and appreciated him more thoroughly during his lifetime. One great English poet, Robert Browning, ungrudgingly acknowledged the originality and beauty of Beddoes's lyrics; but to the critics of his own day the author of *Death's Jest-book* was practically unknown. No wonder, then, that Browning should have said: "If ever I were professor of poetry at Oxford, my first lecture at the University would be on Beddoes, a forgotten Oxford poet."

The last words have suggested the title of this article. Mr. Edmund Gosse, a critic for whom I have the utmost respect, and from whom I have received some very interesting letters, though I never had the pleasure of meeting him, has given a sketch of poor Beddoes in his readable book, *Critical Kit-Kats*. I do not assent to Mr. Gosse's views as to the poet's true position in English literature; but I do not hesitate to say that justice has not been done to the man who, perhaps more than any other Englishman of the nineteenth century, was impregnated with the spirit of Ford and Massinger.

Thomas Lovell Beddoes was born at Rodney Place, Clifton, on

July 20, 1803. His father was a celebrated physician, Dr. Thomas Beddoes, who died in 1809, leaving his son to the guardianship of Davies Giddy, afterwards known as Sir Davies Gilbert. The mother of the poet was a sister of the great Irish novelist, Maria Edgeworth; and for this reason alone Beddoes has some claim to sympathetic interest on the part of purely Irish readers. He was educated at Bath Grammar School and at the Charterhouse; and some glimpses of his peculiarities as a schoolboy are given by a friend of his named Bevan, who relates that Beddoes on one occasion, when the pupils at the Charterhouse were forbidden to play hockey in the cloisters, led a revolt against what he regarded as a despotic ukase, and, though he had never before handled a hockey-stick, made his appearance armed with one and wearing a fillet of rags round his head stuck full of feathers, while on a pasteboard shield which he carried was seen the device of a fist doubled, and the motto *Manus hæc inimica tyrannis*. We learn furthermore, that in his fourteenth year, while still at the Charterhouse, he wrote verses, and a fragment of his verse produced at this early age, which has been preserved, shows a curious tendency towards metaphysical speculation such as schoolboys rarely exhibit. In 1819 a sonnet by him appeared in the *Morning Post*. In 1820 he entered Oxford. He won few academic distinctions there; but, while still a freshman, he published *The Improvisatore*—a marvellous production for a youth of eighteen. Beddoes was so much dissatisfied with it himself in after years that he destroyed every copy of it that he could find. Fortunately there were a few copies beyond his reach, so that the poem is now included in the collection of his works edited by Mr. Edmund Gosse and issued in 1890 by Messrs. Dent & Co. In 1822 appeared *The Bride's Tragedy*, one of Beddoes's most finished works, though, as a critic in *Blackwood* pointed out, it was full of youthful extravagance. It was enthusiastically praised by Bryan Waller Procter (better known as "Barry Cornwall"), and gave rise to a friendship which lasted up to the time of Beddoes's death. In 1823 Procter introduced Beddoes to Thomas Forbes Kelsall, a solicitor of literary tastes practising in Southampton, and, while staying in that town, where he devoted himself to reading for his bachelor's degree, he found a congenial companion in Kelsall. Beddoes, during his sojourn in Southampton, wrote *The Second Brother* and *Torrismond*.

After this he was in frequent correspondence with Kelsall, and in the collection of "Letters" which Mr. Edmund Gosse edited two years ago, we find the poet discussing such topics as the characteristics of Shakespeare, the state of English poetry after Shelley's death, and the prospects of the drama, for the benefit of this apparently liberal-minded legal practitioner.

The following passage which occurs in a letter to Kelsall dated 1824 shows how intense was Beddoes's admiration for the genius of Shelley:

"The disappearance of Shelley from the world seems, like the tropical setting of that luminary to which his poetical genius can at all be compared with reference to the compositions of his day, to have been followed by instant darkness and owl-season: whether Darley is to be the comet, or tender full-faced L. E. L., the milk-and-watery moon of our darkness, are questions for the astrologers; if I were the literary water-guesser for 1825, I would safely prognosticate fog, rain, blight, in due succession for its dullard months."

When these words were written Byron had been about four months dead; and though Coleridge, Wordsworth, Moore, and Southey were still alive, they had already done their best work.

In 1823 Beddoes commenced *Lou's Arrow Poisoned* and *The Last Man*, but he never finished them. In February 1824 he wrote in the following odd fashion concerning the *The Last Man*: "There are now three acts in my drawer. When I have got two more I shall stitch them together and stick the sign of a fellow tweedling a mask in his fingers with 'Good entertainment for man and ass' understood, as the grammarians (not the Chrestomathic ones) say."

The serious illness of his mother necessitated a visit to Florence, where she was staying, in the summer of 1824. She died ere he could reach her; but he remained for some time in Florence and there met Walter Savage Landor. On his return to England he commenced the study of German. In 1825 he projected the publication of a volume of lyrics entitled *Outulana, or Effusions Amorous, Pathetic, and Fantastical*. In May 1825 he took his bachelor's degree at Oxford. In the following June he wrote to Kelsall stating that he was thinking of "a very Gothic-styled tragedy" for which he had "a jewel of a name — *Death's Jest-book*," adding grimly: "Of course no one will ever read it." This extraordinary dramatic poem — certainly a masterpiece of its kind — was finished in October 1826.

In July 1825 Beddoes, having resolved to adopt medicine as a profession, went to Gottingen. From that time he only paid a few short visits to England, and lived entirely in Continental cities. He learned both to speak and write German. He appears to have become an extreme Radical — almost a Revolutionist — in his political views. When he had completed his course of medical studies he went to Zurich, where he practised as a doctor. During a short residence in Wurzburg in Bavaria he incurred the animosity of the King, whom he irreverently described as an "ingenious jackanapes."

In 1838 we find him preparing a collection of lyrical poems entitled *The Ivory Gate*; and about the same time he was engaged in translating Grainger's work on the Spinal Column into German. Before the close of the same year his personal safety was endangered in Zurich owing to an attack on the town by a mob of 6000

peasants, half of them 'unarmed' and the other half armed with scythes, dung-forks, and poles. In March 1840, after having seen some of his political associates murdered, he managed to effect his escape through the assistance of one of the leaders of the Liberal party named Jasper.

We are not here directly concerned with either the political or religious views of Beddoes. He certainly was an extreme politician, and would probably be regarded as an Agnostic, though this is by no means quite clear. The subject of death had for his mind a mingled horror and fascination. The following passage from one of his letters throws a lurid light on his mental idiosyncrasies: "Dissatisfaction is the lot of the poet. . . . I am now so thoroughly penetrated with the conviction of the absurdity and unsatisfactory nature of human existence that I search with avidity for every shadow of a proof or probability of an after-existence both in the material and immaterial nature of man. . . . It is difficult to scrape together hints for a doctrine of immortality. . . . Man appears to have found out this secret for himself, and it is certainly the best part of all religion and philosophy, the only truth worth demonstrating, an anxious question full of hope and fear and promise, for which Nature appears to have appointed one solution—Death."

The tragic conclusion of Beddoes's own life might perhaps be regarded by some people as a practical exemplification of his weird and melancholy pessimism. After a visit to England in 1842, he went to reside in Baden in Aargau. In 1844 he went to Giessen, whither he was attracted by the experiments of Liebig, the famous chemist. While staying in the latter place he wrote two of his most exquisite lyrics, *The Swallow Leaves Her Nest* and *In Lover's Ear a Wild Voice Cried*. In 1847 he again went to England, and while in London visited the Procters. He was so very shy in disposition that he refused invitations to dinner for fear of meeting strangers. On one occasion, when the Procters invited him to come and dine with them and afterwards go to Drury Lane Theatre, he failed to keep the appointment, but they found him, while on their way to the latter place, in the custody of the police for having attempted to set the building on fire by burning a £5 note outside it! Procter easily persuaded the officers of the law that there was little danger to the theatre from an experiment which only showed the poet's slender appreciation of the value of money. In 1847 Beddoes went to live in Frankfurt with a young baker named Degen—a "nice-looking" fellow of eighteen, "dressed in a blue blouse, fine in expression," and of a natural dignity of manner." While residing there he got blood-poisoning through the virus of a dead body entering a cut in his hand. Though he recovered, the effect of the injury was to produce in him deep mental dejection. For six months he would see nobody but Degen, whom he persuaded

to adopt the career of an actor. In 1848 he and Degen wandered about together through Germany and Switzerland. In Zurich he chartered the theatre for one night to enable his friend to appear in the part of Hotspur. At Basle, while separated from Degen, he fell into such a condition of despondency that he inflicted a deep wound in his right leg with a razor. The waiter who attended him said sympathetically to Miss Zoë King, the poet's cousin, when she afterwards visited the spot: "Il etait miserable—il a voulu se tuer." He was removed to the hospital of the town, where it was found necessary to amputate his leg, gangrene having set in. It seemed as if a change for the better had come after this terrible physical ordeal. Beddoes read a great deal, and talked of going to Italy when he had got stronger. On January 26 he was able to go out, and managed, owing to his position as a medical man, to procure a deadly poison called Kurara. At a later hour Dr. Echlin, who had performed the amputation, was called in, and found the unfortunate poet lying unconscious with a note addressed to an English friend named Philips folded over his breast. The words scrawled in lead-pencil on this note were of that grimly humorous kind which perhaps makes us shudder more than any tragic declamation: ". . . I am food for what I am good for—worms. . . I ought to have been . . . a good poet. Life was too great a bore on one peg, and that a bad one." Certain practical directions which exhibit a very matter-of-fact view of ordinary affairs are omitted from the above extract.

Beddoes died that night at ten o'clock, and was interred under a cypress in the cemetery of the hospital.

The gloom of this closing scene is equalled by that of the finest passages in Beddoes's poetry. It is hard to analyse either the mind or the work of a man of this type. The Philistine is sure to declare him a madman, and so to settle the difficulty without further psychological speculation.

But Beddoes was so cynical, so clear-headed, so scientifically accurate in his logical estimate of the world as he found it, that to pronounce him insane seems little better than stupidity, or at least an utter lack of discrimination.

His letters show him to have been a critic of rare culture as well as subtle intuition. For example, can anything be finer than his estimate of Shakespeare? In a letter to Procter he wrote: "About Shakespeare you don't say enough. He was an incarnation; and you might just as well attempt to remodel the seasons, the laws of life and death, as to alter one jot or tittle of his eternal thoughts." He was fearless in expressing his dislikes, and did not hesitate to declare that he considered Jean Paul Richter—Carlyle's idol—a "pedantical punster." He loved the Germans better than his own

countrymen, if we may draw any definite conclusion from the following trenchant words : " You people of England have a pretty false notion of the German character, and flatter yourselves, with your peculiar and invincible insular self-complacency, that you know all about it ; for national vanity, after all, I believe you are unequalled. The Frenchman rests his boast on the military glories of *la grande nation* ; the German smokes a contemptuous pipe over the philosophical works of his neighbours ; but the Englishman will monopolise all honourable feeling, all gentle breeding, all domestic virtue, and, indeed, has ever been the best Puritan."

When we come to deal with his poetry, we are startled by a certain ghostliness—a quality which is utterly absent from the works of Burns and Wordsworth, though we find it in Coleridge's *Christabel* and *The Ancient Mariner*, and in Shelley's *Witch of Atlas*. In all that Beddoes has written there is a haunting sense of some dread, unearthly presence—an echo which comes to us from the world of phantoms. In *The Bride's Tragedy* it assumes a somewhat puerile form. In *Death's Jest-book* it attains the height of the most terrible tragic irony. Having studied Ford until his phantasmal creations became more real than anything in the shape of flesh and blood, Beddoes was like a man possessed, if one may say so, from a literary point of view. He was, so to speak, haggard. His own predisposition to shrink from the thought of death, and yet to idealise and magnify its terrible image, made Ford's conceptions all the more palpable to his mind. In one of the tales in *The Improvisatore*, entitled "Rodolph," the fascinating horror of the charnel-house is impressed on the reader's mind with singular force. Poe has never written anything in which there is such an appeal to the innate fear of the unknown, the supramundane, which man vainly endeavours to laugh to scorn with the cheap philosophy of latter-day materialism. In *Death's Jest-book* the drama from beginning to end has only one keynote—death. Love, ambition, revenge—everything must give way before that irresistible conqueror, that merciless leveller. The foundation of this strange dramatic poem was the historical legend which related how a Duke of Munsterberg was stabbed to death by his court fool in 1257.

In the introduction to the poem occur the following beautiful lines :

" Death's darts are sometimes Love's. So Nature tells
When laughing waters close o'er drowning men ;
When in flowers' honied corners poison dwells ;
When beauty dies, and the unwearied ken,
Of those who seek a cure for long despair
Will learn. Death hath his dimples everywhere.
Love only on the cheek which is to me most fair."

For its combination of the grotesquely gruesome and the naively.

fantastic it would be hard to find a parallel to *Old Adam, the Carrion Crow* :

“ Old Adam, the carrion crow,
The old crow of Cairo,
He sat in the shower, and let it flow
Under his tail and over his crest ;
And through every feather
Leaked the wet weather ;
And the bough swung under his nest ;
For his beak it was heavy with marrow.
Is that the wind dying ? O no ;
It's only two devils that blow
Through a murderer's bones to and fro
In the ghosts' moonshine.

“ Ho ! Eve, my grey carrion-wife,
When we have supped on king's marrow,
Where shall we drink and make merry for life ?
Our nest is Queen Cleopatra's skull,
'Tis cloven and cracked, and battered and hacked ;
But with tears of blue eyes it is full !
Let us drink there, my raven of Cairo !
Is that the wind dying ? O no ;
It's only two devils that blow
Through a murderer's bones to and fro
In the ghosts' moonshine.”

Here we have a refrain that recalls Hamlet's soliloquy over Yorick's skull, but in a more fanciful and, no doubt, a more morbid key.

Some of Beddoes's best lyrics may be favourably compared to the best work of Shelley and Keats in the same department of poetry. I must quote two little poems, full of tenderness and palpitating rhythmic power, before I close. They are not well known, and will be new to many readers. The first is a love lyric :

“ How many times do I love thee, dear !
Tell me how many thoughts there be
In the atmosphere
Of a new-fall'n year,
Whose white and sable hours appear
The latest flake of Eternity :
So many times do I love thee, dear.

“ How many times do I love again ?
Tell me how many beads there are
In a silver chain
Of evening rain,
Unravell'd from the tumbling main,
And threading the eye of a yellow star ;
So many times do I love again.”

The other strikes the sad note of death, only too familiar to the few who have studied Beddoes's poetry :

"The swallow leaves her nest,
 The soul my weary breast,
 But, therefore, let the rain
 On my grave
 Fall pure. For why complain?
 Since both will come again
 O'er the wave.

"The wind, dead leaves, and snow
 Doth hurry to and fro,
 And once a day shall break
 (O'er the wave,
 When a storm of ghosts shall shake
 The dead until they wake
 In the grave."

The limits of space will not permit me to enter upon an examination of other works of this gifted but supremely unhappy poet, who has been too long allowed to remain in an obscure corner of the great Temple of Fame. Though he does not belong to the first order of poets, he must rank high amongst the writers of unique and polished verse. In some respects he was an imitator of the Elizabethan dramatists whom Charles Lamb loved. But he possessed a distinct source of original poetic feeling and fancy, which may fairly entitle him to a place far above the modern herd of minor verse-writers. He is a kind of lesser Coleridge, with all that great poet's incapacity to work out conceptions to a logical termination, and a grasp of the weird and intangible which transcends that of even the master-mind that gave us *The Ancient Mariner*.

In his realisation of the universal sway of death Beddoes appeals to the modern world, so restless, so incredulous, and yet so full of shuddering, faithless superstition. He resembles Heine and Baudelaire, but he is less sceptical than the former and less corrupt than the latter. In spite of his morbid fancies, his mind was essentially pure. He suggests a forcible analogy to the hero of Turgenev's *Fathers and Sons*; he, it may be remembered, was also a medical man, who closed a brilliant career by taking his own life.

Hatred of conventionality, independence, aloofness, were three of the most striking traits in this poet's character. These qualities may, if carried to an extravagant length, become dangerous, and yet they always rest on a foundation of noble manhood.

In some respects Beddoes seems something like an anachronism in the nineteenth century. One would expect to find him in the company of Ford and Marlowe and Massinger and Webster. He is by no means a commonplace type of poet. He mainly deals with a class of subjects which belong to the borderland between the natural and the supernatural. There are weaknesses in his earlier productions which are entirely absent from his most perfect work, *Death's Jest-book*. It would be impossible to deny that this dramatic poem

is full of power and originality. And yet the poetry of Beddoes might have been left in obscurity, if not oblivion, were it not for the praiseworthy efforts of Mr. Kelsall and Mr. Gosse. Certainly the genius of this gifted but unhappy man has not been adequately appreciated, although he has a few ardent admirers, and his true place amongst the poets of this century has yet to be properly determinated.

D. F. HANNIGAN.

THE NEW LUNACY BILL.

THE defunct Lunacy Bill of last Session has, as was anticipated, been re-introduced this. Last Session the Bill passed the House of Lords, but on notice of opposition was at once withdrawn in the Lower House. And first, a word in regard to it as it appeared last year.

Couched in strict legal phraseology necessitating almost a special education and training to interpret, small wonder that it was viewed with dismay by medical men, a class not, as a rule, over-gifted with legal acumen. Why, in heaven's name, the entire Lunacy Act is not remodelled and rendered intelligible in clear and homely English to those whom it concerns, instead of adding to what is already cumbrous, baffles ordinary comprehension. Let lawyers quirk and quibble, when pitted against each other, over the terminology which is apparently inseparable from the practice of their profession, but in the framing of Acts, common sense, to say nothing of consideration for ordinary mortals, should lead them to clothe their decrees in other than mummified and antique language. For the Bill bristled with fines and imprisonments up to even two years' hard labour. Surely it was an oversight that torture and the stake were omitted. And one can easily imagine a benevolent and kindly superintendent, whose mental faculties owing to advancing age are not of the acutest, jeopardising, not by a wilful, not even by a negligent, mis-statement, his liberty and honour. The Bill, in truth, made no clear distinction between wilful and negligent, certainly did not provide for the contingency of error due to impairment of the senses and mental faculties of declining years. Was imprisonment with two years' hard labour to be the sentence, or would the optional fine under the circumstances be accepted? Truly the life of an asylum official is not a happy one! It may not be amiss perhaps to briefly review the circumstances which undoubtedly caused the abandonment of the Bill last Session. As a balm to its severities and utmost penalties of the law, the Bill, as then introduced, offered, on attaining the age of sixty years, a compulsory superannuation clause, instead of the one at present in force—discretionary on the part of asylum committees. Methinks this rather ignored the grave conclusion of a former select Parliamentary Committee, which determined fifteen years spent in asylum life long

enough service to qualify for superannuation. If any value was to be attached to this finding—and we can hardly credit that the framer of the Bill was ignorant upon the subject—the Bill, as introduced last Session evidently attached little importance to it. Or if it did, and of that there is no very distinct evidence, we would, had it passed, have looked forward to appointments in asylums being made at a much more mature age than now obtains, at or somewhere about the age of forty-five.

The absurdity of this is manifest, as it would eventually result in asylums being practically staffed by sexagenarians. If, on the other hand, officials were to be appointed at the age which at present is customary, the result would have been equally disastrous, and likewise inimical to the best interests of the patients. For the forty years' service, and no retirement till the age of sixty, would have prevented any one entering the service with any idea of adopting it as a permanent employment. Frequent changes in the staff would thus have been constantly occurring, and in due course asylums would have in great measure been manned by the young and inexperienced. The consequence of either of these inevitable results can be easily foretold—disaster and calamity to both patients and officials. As a matter of fact, with very few exceptions, those entering asylum life do so between the ages of twenty and twenty-five years. At the age of fifty then, which, according to the existing Lunacy Act, is the age at which asylum officials may retire, these can show not the specified service of fifteen years, but one of thirty or twenty-five years, according to the age on entering. The age which the Bill fixed for retirement was sixty-five years. That practically implies thirty-five or forty years' service. And yet asylum officials had been led by present and past legislation and pronouncement to believe that fifteen or twenty years' service was sufficient, considering the nature of the employment. How to reconcile all these incongruities with presumably the carefully thought-out opinion of the Lord Chancellor, who evidently considered the provisions of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, 1896, as suitable and just to apply to asylum officials, was well-nigh an impossible task. The Bill also proposed to apply one-sixtieth of salary and emoluments for each year of service, both in the case of the highest and the most poorly salaried official. Taking the extremes of the official ladder, this particular feature of the Bill seemed a piece of cruel and ironical facetiousness, more especially as the indifferently and poorly salaried officials are unable to make provision for old age.

Further, how many are there who could actually serve forty years in this special line of life? If perchance a few be found who, by reason of exceptional robustness, survive this terrible ordeal of servitude and emerge mentally intact, would these isolated instances compensate the disadvantages accruing from the majority dragging

on a weary and useless existence? For experience has shown that, so far as the actual performance of their duty goes, officials after a service of twenty-five years are not to be depended upon—are, to put it plainly, done. And yet it was beneficently proposed in the Bill to further increase the period of service by an extension of fifteen years, and we were expected to hail it with delight. True! the departure was a step in the right direction, substituting as it did a compulsory for the non-obligatory pension clause of the existing Lunacy Act. But how many of us would live to reap the advantage? "On attaining the age of sixty years, and having completed an aggregate service of forty years." Such in substance were the words, molten in significance, which impinged and seared our vision. From the age of twenty up to that of sixty years attendant upon the insane! With all reverence might it be said, God save us from such a fate.

And we are to contribute annually a percentage of salary and emoluments. With the forty years' service, we could safely assert that the majority of us would never live to enjoy the return of our premiums, to say nothing of bonuses and the pecuniary loss to our relatives. The odds, in fact, were all in favour of the Asylum Insurance Company. We cannot for a moment believe that the Lord Chancellor ever realised what the application of the Poor Law Officers' Superannuation Act, 1896, would mean for asylum officials. So much for the Bill as it appeared last Session.

And now as it appears this. It may be remarked that with two exceptions no material alteration is to be detected in its main features. In fact, we can only describe the Bill as another piece of glaring patchwork added to that legislative quilt, the Lunacy Act. Not unnaturally, perhaps, the attention of asylum officials will again centre round the superannuation clauses; and it is with pleasure we note that their tenor is distinctly more satisfactory—more just. Indeed, it is perhaps no exaggeration to state that they constitute the only redeeming feature of the Bill. As to the principle involved in the question of superannuation opinions will no doubt differ. It may, however, be safely asserted that to an overwhelming majority of asylum officials the clauses are agreeable. A few objectors may, and undoubtedly do, exist, but it does not require a minute analysis to detect the personal equation as entering largely into the question. It would require some strong proof, at any rate, to convince one to the contrary.

The Parliamentary Committee of the Medico-Psychological Association will probably be up and doing. How far the wishes of the bulk of asylum officials are likely to be represented by its opinion on the question, and in what direction will lie the nature of the influence it will doubtless bring to bear, are as yet unknown quantities. In any case, any action taken by it in the matter will

of a surety be keenly watched and criticised. For is it not composed of the nobility, and constitutes the Upper House, so to speak, of the asylum cosmos?

We are glad, then, to note that the Bill in some respects advocates, as regards superannuation, a more favourable consideration of asylum officials than did its predecessor of last Session. It makes, for example, obligatory (this, however, was also insisted on in the Bill as it appeared last Session) what in the present Lunacy Act is optional, and although the standard of allowance of one-sixtieth of salary and emoluments for each year of service remains the same, a discretionary power seems to be given to asylum committees to supplement the amount.

“And the allowance to be granted to an officer or servant under section 280 of the principal Act shall not be less than would be granted if he were an officer or servant to whom the Poor Law Officers’ Superannuation Act, 1896, applies.”

So reads the latter part of clause 20 of the new Bill. This, as we take it, is meant to apply to those officials whose salaries are insufficient to enable provision to be made for old age, and whose duties compel a more close and constant attendance upon the insane than holds in the case of others. The age at which retirement may—not necessarily must—take place remains as stated in the principal Act, fifty years. We assume this choice of retirement at the age of fifty is intended more for those officials who are appointed between the ages of twenty and twenty-five (assistant medical officers, matrons, and nurses), and whose tenure of office only holds so long as they remain single. So far as we are aware marriage is not prohibited among officials in other public services. Surely, then, some concession—such as optional retirement at or any time after the age of fifty should be granted to those asylum officials upon whom this embargo is laid.

We trust, also, that when the Bill reaches the discussive stage in the House, the trying nature of asylum work, with all its peculiar hardships and worries, and the stringent conditions attached to office, will be duly weighed and considered. For with salary and emoluments amounting in all, roughly, to about £50 per annum, thirty-sixtieths, after thirty years’ service, is not a very happy prospect for the asylum nurse to look forward to. And if, for example, owing to ill-health retirement should become necessary after fifteen years’ service, fifteen-sixtieths is not sufficient to exclude the possibility, even probability, of the workhouse. The permissive element in the superannuation clause to increase the allowance beyond that of the Poor Law Officers’ Superannuation Act indicates an appreciation of the grim hardships of the more poorly paid asylum officials. It certainly affords an opportunity to asylum committees of judging cases on their merits, and of dealing more

generously than the law insists with its subordinate officers and servants.

We note the elision in the Bill of clause 29 of last Session's Bill. It is well. Had asylum officials been criminals, it could not have been proposed to deal more severely with them. With its repeal, however, has gone the contemptuous amusement the suggested penalties aroused, and but a mournful pity for something or some one keeps it in our recollection.

So far we are not aware that the question of a graduated pension scale has ever been mooted, but some such scheme, formulated as an amendment, might, it is suggested, be favourably received by the House. It would certainly benefit those officers and servants whose salaries do not enable them to make provision for old age. This aspect of the pension clause is well worth attention, and we can heartily recommend it to the consideration of all interested in the question, because, judging from the way the clauses dealing with superannuation were shelved last Session, the Lord Chancellor apparently considered them of minor importance.

We would also point out that the Bill gives no assurance or guarantee for security of office. Will the Secretary of State, who it is likely may be substituted for the Local Government Board, be a Court of Appeal for any official unjustly dismissed, and have power to order his or her restitution to office? Because if officials are to contribute a compulsory levy to a pension fund, they ought to have some security that the holding of office will not, as might possibly be the case, be dependent on caprice. Owing to the law which compels the annual re-appointment of at least some officials, and a custom which holds in some asylums of making appointments for a limited term of years, a loophole is offered, whereby any compulsory pension clause is, if a committee feel so inclined, practically rendered nugatory. Considering the constant changes that take place in county councils, asylum committees, and bodies of that class, there is no doubt that counties opposed to the granting of pensions will simply evade the intention of the Act and fail to reappoint. In other counties, again, in which pensions are given, but in which asylum committees prefer to retain the right of giving in their own hands, a compulsory pension clause in the new Act, without annulling the clause necessitating the annual reappointment of officials, would practically leave the granting of pensions as it at present stands—optional on the part of committees. We would like to call attention to this aspect of the question, and might we further suggest as a basis upon which to determine some equitable scheme of superannuation, that a service of twenty-five years be a maximum, and entitle to two-thirds of salary and emoluments, twenty years to a half, and fifteen years' service to a third in the case of all subordinate officers and servants whose salary and

emoluments do not reach a certain amount. Also that a service of twenty-five years carry with it the right of retirement irrespective of age.

Reviewing the Bill as a whole, we cannot say that it has in any way tended to lighten the ponderosity of the existing Lunacy Act. The lines upon which it is drafted appear, indeed, to be based upon a limited, perhaps unfortunate, experience of asylum misdeeds, and would seem to indicate a belief that even in the present times an individual can mysteriously disappear from the ken of kith and kin in the maelstrom of private asylums.

X.

THE HISTORY OF THE FORMS AND MIGRATIONS OF THE SIGNS OF THE CROSS AND THE SU-ASTIKA.

PART III.—THE BEGINNINGS OF ZODIACAL TIME RECKONING.

THIS year, beginning at the autumnal equinox when the sun was leaving the constellation Scorpio, to which his mother had been led by the seven scorpions, and entering the sign of Sagittarius, gives us, in addition to the information I have already recorded, a most important chronological index. The year was, as we have seen, connected with the constellation of the Bull Pūshan, which ruled the first of the ten lunar months of gestation of the sun-god born at its commencement, the bull which, with the alligator, led the star Gemini to the house of Divodasa, son of Vadhriashva, the gelded sun-horse, the ten lunar months of gestation. It consequently represented a conclusion formed by Zodiacal observers who had watched the course of the sun through the stars. Therefore, in the calculations on which this conclusion was formed, the Akkadian star-watchers must have noticed from their Zigurrats, or towers of observation, that the sun-god which was passing out of Scorpio at the autumnal equinox had been in Taurus at the beginning of February–March; and these observations must have been made very long before the year 4700 B.C., which was about the time when he entered Taurus at the vernal equinox. The month February–March, thus indicated as the beginning of the year of the sun-bull, is that dedicated in the Hindu calendar to Phalgun, the god of fruits (phul), the calf of the older god Pūshan, who was in the *Mahābhārata* year called Arjuna, the companion of Krishna, the sun-antelope. The difference between the time when the sun was in Taurus in the beginning of February–March and that when he was in that constellation at the vernal equinox must, to judge by the evidence given by the sign Aries, have amounted to some thousands of years, for it was not till about 2000 B.C. that the equinox fell in Aries, or about 2700 years after it had fallen in Taurus. Therefore the date we have now reached, when the sun was in Taurus in the beginning of February–March, must approach somewhat closely to that indicated by the passage of the Pole-star from Vega in 8000 B.C. into a star in Hercules. This

is essentially the constellation of the sun-god, and all tradition tends to prove that sun-worship became predominant over Pole-star worship when the Pole-star entered Hercules. It was the constellation of the Phœnician Archal and of the Greek sun-god, whose year of twelve months is represented as his twelve labours. He is also the god who is represented in pictorial astronomy as treading the constellation Draco underfoot as he toils up the heavenly mountain to reach the constellation Lyra which the Pole-star had just left. In fact, his object is apparently to take the Pole-star from Lyra.

Also at the time when the sun was in Taurus, at the beginning of the month ending with the vernal equinox, it must have passed through Aries in January–February. This is the month named in the Hindu calendar Magh, the month in which the Chiroos, sons of the bird, and all the ruling aboriginal tribes of Chutia Nagpore and Maghada, the land of the alligator, now begin their year, which is still reckoned by the Santals as one of thirteen lunar months. The year beginning at the end of January February with St. Valentine's Day is, as I have shown in the *History of the Week*,¹ one also of thirteen months, which was adopted by the Jews as the first complete year of the sun-circuit. It was the year of the thirteen children of Jacob, which began with the feast of Purim, held on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar (February–March) to celebrate the death of Haman and his ten sons, representing, like the Indian Vāhlika and his ten sons, the eleven lunar months of gestation of the sun-horse. They were slain by Nordecai, or Marduk, the Babylonian sun calf-god, the equivalent of the Hindu Phalgun, and he was aided by Esther, who was the Phœnician moon-goddess Ashtoreth.* That is to say, this year of the sun-god, begun by the victory of Marduk the bull-calf, was one in which the sun entered Taurus in February–March. This last year, beginning under the auspices of Marduk, the bull constellation Taurus, in the middle of February, is the year represented in the Hindu Vedic calendar as that in which the sun-maiden—who had been wedded, as we have seen, to Pūshan at the winter solstice—becomes the bride of Soma, the male moon, at the beginning of the year. For, as we are told in the wedding hymn (*Rig.* x. 85, 13), the wedding oxen were slain in Māgha (January–February) and the marriage consummated in Arjuna, or Phalgun (February–March). This mention of the two months marks the year beginning in February–March as coming next after that beginning in January–February, the Māgha year. This mother-Māgha was the month consecrated to the mother of the Ram-sun ruled by the constellation Aries, called Diti, or the second in the list of the thirteen wives of Kashyapa. This year, beginning when the sun was in Aries in January–February, is apparently that of the rule of Yudishthira, meaning the most steadfast, the eldest of the

¹ Hewitt, *History of the Week*, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, August 1897, pp. 143 ff

Pāṇḍava princes, for we are told in the *Mahābhārata* that it began in the first half of Māgha on the death of his uncle Bhishma, the leader and father-god of the Kaurāvyas.¹ This year of Yudishthira is distinctly connected by tradition with that beginning at the autumnal equinox, for the ancient Hindu astronomer who took the name of Vyāsa, and who is quoted by Albiruni, tells us that Yudishthira was born in the month of Bhādra-pada (August–September); that is, the month ruled by Scorpio and ending with the equinox.² Hence it is clear that in traditional Hindu history the year of Bhishma was one intervening between the ten-months year of the sun-god son of Pūshan, conceived at the winter solstice and born at the autumnal equinox, and the thirteen-months year of Yudishthira and Marduk. That is to say, the year of Bhishma was that of the Chiroos and ploughing races, beginning with January–February. This was, as I have shown, the year of the Kuru-Panchālas, the Kaurāvyas of the *Mahābhārata*, beginning in Māgha at the official ploughing of the national land by the king prescribed in the *Brāhmanas*.³ This custom of beginning the year by an official ploughing ceremony is still preserved in China, where the Emperor opens the year about the 20th of January by ploughing the royal field.

But to make the chronological succession clear for this and the other years used at the beginning of Zodiacal reckonings, I must return to the history of the Hindu royal races, in which the last incident I told was the birth of Vyāsa, the alligator-god, as the son of Satyāvati, the fish-mother. Satyāvati's next adventure after the birth of Vyāsa was her marriage with Shantanu, meaning the healthy one, the great king, who was brother of Vāhlika, the father-god of the Takkas. Vāhlika and his ten sons were the Hindu analogies of Haman and his ten, and they both denoted the year of eleven lunar months preceding the solar-lunar year of thirteen months, and the solar year of the sun-circle of 360 days and twelve months, the two years said in *Rig.* i. 25, 8, to be known to Varuna, the barley-god of the ploughing races. Shantanu and his brother Devāpi, the rain priest, are in *Rig.* x. 98, called the sons of Rishitishena, he who has the lance for his weapon. In the *Mahābhārata* they are the two senior members of a triad in which Vāhlika is the youngest.⁴ They are thus, by their parentage, the sons of the lance or rain-pole, the three gods of the tridents carried by Vāhlika and his ten sons as the Yūpa or sacrificial stake. Shantanu, the eldest of the triad, is therefore the equivalent of Sek or Shesh Nāg, the water ocean-snake, placed by the rain-god Vasu, the Vedic Devāpi or relation (āpi) of the bright gods, at the bottom of Mt. Mandara. Shantanu, before he became the god of the corn-growing worshippers

¹ *Mahābhārata Anushāsana Parva*, 167.

² Sachau's *Albiruni's India*, vol. i. chap. xxxiv. p. 340.

³ Eggeling's *Sat. Brāh.* v. v. 2, 55. *S. D. E.* vol. xli. p. 144. Hewitt, *History of the Week*, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, August 1897, pp. 144 ff.

⁴ *Mahābhārata Adi (Sambhava) Parva*, xcv. p. 285.

of Vāsu, the grandfather of Satyāvati, was the husband of Gungā or Gungu, the mother of the land (gan), the river Ganges. She is called Aditi in *Rig.* x. 72 and Gungā in the *Mahābhārata*,¹ and is said, in *Rig.* x. 72, 3, 4, to be the child of the parents with outstretched legs (Uttāna-pad), that is, of the triangular mother-goddess—the goddess Cybele (meaning a cave) of the Phrygians, the goddess Bahu of the Phœnicians and Aphrodite of Paphos, both of whom were worshipped under the form of a triangle. This also appears to have been the sign of Daksha as the visible god, who was also apparently represented by the open hand, a sign of divinity, frequently shown on ancient coins, as appears by the names of his Phrygian and Cretan priests, the Daktuloi, the god of the ten fingers or ten lunar months of gestation. These are the ten fingers, or ten sister maidens, daughters of Vivasvat, who in the *Rigveda* tend the Soma-tree whence the sun-god was born.² These ten maidens were the ten eldest daughters of Daksha and wives of Kashyapa up to Vinatū, and the first of these was Aditi. She is said to have brought forth eight sons, the eighth of whom is called in the *Rigveda* Mārtānda, or the dead egg, an equivalent expression to the name of Vadhri-ashva, or the gelded horse, given to the father of Divodāsa. In the *Mahābhārata* she is said to have thrown the first seven into the river as soon as they were born, and to have left her husband after the birth of the eighth son, whom she allowed to live as the sexless sun of day. She took him with her to her river home, and he only returned to his father as a god “like to the sun in glory” when he had attained his manhood.³ He is called Dyū, or the bright one, the sun-god who succeeded to the rule of the year, which had formerly been governed by the seven stars of the Nagur, or Plough constellation of the Great Bear, whose rule had passed away with that of the mother-river of the sons of the rivers and of the year of forty weeks of gestation. He was, as the successor of this dead year reckoning, the sun-god of the eight-rayed star—the Phœnician Eshmun, who is also the eighth of a series in which the first seven were the stars of the Great Bear. He is also Astika, or the eighth (asti) god of another form of the Hindu sun myth, who was the son of a bisexual god, a father and mother named Jaratkara (he who makes old), the Pole-star god. He in the *Mahābhārata* helped Janamejaya, the son of Parikshit, the circling sun, to destroy the snake-gods of Pole-star worship who had slain his father; that is to say, that the sun-god Parikshit was a sun-god who, like the stars, measured time by his daily revolutions round the Pole.

In tracing the mythological age of Bhishma and the years connected with him, we have a guide in Vāhlika. He is called brother of Bhishma's father Shamtann, and Bhishma's recognised superiority

¹ *Mahābhārata Adi (Sambhava) Parva*, xov. p. 285; xoviii. p. 298.

² *Rig.* ix. 8, 4; ix. 15, 8; ix. 1, 7; ix. 14, 5.

³ *Mahābhārata Adi (Sambhava) Parva*, c. p. 306.

to Vāhlika as the ruling god of the year marks his year as succeeding Vāhlika's year of the eleven months of gestation of the sun-horse. The period was one in which solar movements began to be traced among the stars, as we have seen from the evidence adduced as to the connection of the stars Scorpio and Taurus with the sun's position; but it was also one in which the former ruling stars retained their value as astronomical factors. Thus Bhishma is a sun-god who absorbed the stars of the Great Bear to make himself the sun-god of the eight-rayed star.

He is also, as the grandson of the sun-hawk Adrikā, equated with the Egyptian Horus, who is the son of the hawk-mother Hathor. Horus, who was, as we have seen, born like Yudishthira at the autumnal equinox, was also, like those who reckoned time by the months of gestation, specially connected with pairs of time-gods. For he is the tenth of the Memphite series of gods, beginning with Tum, the setting sun of the west, and ending with Horus, the son of Isis, also called Hathor, who was the child of the setting sun of the autumnal equinox. The intervening gods were Shu and Tafnut, the fire-drill and socket,¹ Seb the earth-egg made fertile by the heat engendered by his parents, and Nut the overarching heaven; while their children Isis and Osiris, Set and Nephtys, are the gods of the four quarters of the heavens and of the year of four seasons, which gave birth to its ruling sun-god Horus. Thus he, as the offspring of four pairs, is the centre sun of an eight-rayed star, whose rays are, like those of the Nun, four male and four female figures.

Also Horus is a god of the system of reckoning time by the eleven months of gestation, and in this he is equated with Bhishma. For Bhishma, in the war between the Kaurāvyas and Pāndavas, is the general-in-chief of the Kaurāvyas, who had eleven Akshauhini, or divisions of troops—that is, eleven guides of the axle (aksha) of the revolving year—while the Pāndavas had only seven.² These hosts, when the armies of the contending parties are translated back to their original form of celestial powers, appear to mean the eleven ruling stars of the votaries of the rule of the sun-horse and the seven ruling stars of the Pāndavas. These last were derived from the astronomical system of Babylon, which from the constant connection between the Indian traders and the Persian Gulf was always in close touch with Indian conclusions. In the Akkadian-Babylonian system the seven stars were the seven Lumasi or guarding stars, which I will explain presently. The system of eleven stars, which I will now describe, apparently arose in India, where the worship of the sun-horse was, as I have fully shown, a most prominent feature in the final ritual of the Soma sacrifice. And it owed its origin to the great Ikshvāku race, the sons of the sugar-cane, who were a

¹ Shu means "to dry with heat," and Tafnut (tfn) the fire engendered by Shu.

² *Mahābhārata Udyoga Parva*, lvi.

race of horsemen called the 'Sakya,' and who succeeded the Khati or Hittite worshippers of the Ashvins or twin gods of generation, whose chariot was drawn, besides the constellations I have mentioned, by asses, who drew them to the wedding of the sun-maiden with Soma. These eleven stars are depicted in Vignette IX. of the Papyrus of Ani at the British Museum, a papyrus dating from the 18th Dynasty, or about 1600 B.C. The eleven stars are the seven stars of the Great Bear and the four stars of Pegasus, a constellation forming a square, and called by the Egyptians The Constellation of the Servant. Its four stars are the four sons of Horus, and appear to name the seasons, and among those Hapi (depicted as an ape) is undoubtedly an Indian god, whose name is a form of the Hindu Tamil name Kapi, an ape. He takes the same position in Egypt as he does in India, for he rules the Nile and the rainy season, and the Indian ape-god Maroti is the god who brings up the monsoon winds.

These are the eleven stars of Joseph's dream,² a proof that this grouping of the stars is not an indigenous development in Egypt, but one derived from a foreign source. Also Joseph's name is a form of Asipu the Babylonian diviner, and he was the eleventh son and twelfth child of Jacob, whose thirteenth child was Benjamin, the sun-god of the year of thirteen lunar months, born at Bethlehem Ephrata. This is the place where, as St. Jerome tells, the birth of Tammuz used to be celebrated. It was the town of Boaz, the sun-pillar, son of Rahab the Alligator, and the birthplace of the sun-god David or Dodo, the eighth son of Jesse—meaning he who is the creating God. He was the Hebrew counterpart of the Indian Krishna, the eighth son of Vāsu-deva. Benjamin, again, the thirteenth child of Jacob and the son of Rachel the ewe, was the Jewish equivalent of Kādrū, mother of the Nāgas, who belonged to the second family of Daksha's children, the first closing with Vinatā and the second beginning with Kapilā (meaning the yellow one), the mother of the yellow race of trading Vaishya, the eleventh of the children of Daksha, who was, like Joseph, the prophet-god who founded the city of Kapila-vastu, where the Buddha, the sun-god, was born. It was to the Hindu sun-worshippers a shrine as sacred as Bethlehem to the Semites. The latter meant the House of Lehem, or Lakhma, the Akkadian creating god, of whom I will speak presently. Also, both the children of Jacob and Daksha were the children of the ram-god husband to the ewe-mother, for Jacob—the supplanter of his brother Esau, the Phœnician Usov, the Akkadian Uz, the goat-god—was, like Daksha, the ram sun-god. All this evidence as to the intimate connection between these eleven parent months and stars, the eleven Indian Rudras born of the father Sthānu, the steadfast Pole-star god, who, like Vāhlika and his

¹ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. pp. 166 167.

² Gen. xxxvii, 9.

ten sons, was one of the eleven, tends to prove that the years of Bhishma, Yudishtira, the sun-god Parikshit, and that of the sun fish-god Pradyumna, the son of Krishna,¹ which I am about to describe, were the direct descendants of a year ending with the eleventh month, Ashva-yujau (October–November), and that they were years of thirteen months, measured by Zodiacal methods. The typical year of this series was also one in which, as in the case of Bhishma, the ruling sun-god did not begin his functions as governor of the year with his birth, but that he was hidden by his mother, who took him to her river home, just as Moses or Masu—another sun-god connected, like Bhishma and Pradyumna, with the cult of the sun-antelope—was hidden for three months by his mother in an ark of bulrushes on the river and watched over by his sister Miriam, the Jewish form of the star Min or Spica (α Virginis). The year exactly meeting these conditions is that of the Akkadian sun-god whose year history, as shown by the paths of the moon and sun through the stars, I have already fully told in the *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*.² He was in India the sun-god Pradyumna, meaning the foremost (pra) bright one, son of Krishna, the black antelope, son of the river on whose banks he grazed, and of Rukmeni, the shining moon-goddess.³ He was thus, like Bhishma, the son of the river-mother, and he was born under the guardianship of the moon in Aquarius, the Akkadian constellation Sar, the star embodiment of the cloud-mother Shara.* But he was born, not as the Muggur, or alligator, the symbol of the witch-mother Māgha, but in the form of his cognizance, Makara the dolphin,⁴ the Akkadian Makkar.⁵ This his mother-star is the thirtieth star in the circle of the Thirty Stars I am about to describe. This is the name given both by the Akkadians and the Hindus⁶ to the constellation Capricornus of the goat-fish, showing that it became the star governing the month of October–November at the end of the rule of the goat's governing the reckoning of time and of its supersession by the mother-dolphin. She was the fish-mother goddess of the Phœnicians, the goddess Tir-hatha (the cleft or pool), a name which has been changed into Derceto, and the sun-god Apollo in the form of a dolphin, who brought the priests of the new faith in the ruling sun-god from Crete to Delphi.⁷

For the the first three months of his career after he left Capricornus on the 20th November to the 20th February—that is, from the close of Ashva-yujau, the eleventh month—he with the moon

¹ *Mahābhārata Adi (Sambhava) Parva*, lxvi. p. 188.

² *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iv. pp. 376–387.

³ Also perhaps The Tree- (ruk) mother.

⁴ *Mahābhārata Anushāsana (Anushāsinika) Parva*, xi. 3, p. 41.

⁵ *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iv. p. 377. R. Brown, jun., F.S.A., *Tablet of the Thirty Stars*, star xxx. *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, January. 1890.

⁶ Suchau's *Alburin's India*, vol. i. chap. xix. p. 220.

⁷ Müller, *Die Dorier*. bk. ii. chap. vii. § 6. p. 318; chap. i. §§ 7 and 8, pp. 211–214.

traverses the thirty stars of the Akkadian Tablet of the Thirty Stars marking the moon's positions during the months of Kislev, Tebet, and Sebet, and on the 20th February he, as the sun-god, enters the first sign of the Zodiacal circle of the Ten Kings of Babylon in Aries. This is, as we have seen, the date of the beginning of the year of Yudishthira, and also that on which Parikshit, the circling sun, Yudishthira's successor, was born as the son of the Kusua-grass placed in the womb of Uttarā, the Pole-star goddess, his mother by Ashvatthā-man, the god of the Popul-tree (*Ficus religiosa*) called Ashvattha. He was born as an apparently lifeless infant, but was revived by the healing touch of his father-god Krishna, the black antelope, administered at the vernal equinox, and it was this that made him come to life as the young sun-god who started to run his year's course in the month of Chait (March–April).¹ The year of the Jewish Ox, Marduk, which was also the year of Benjamin, apparently coincided nearly with this, for it began at the feast of Purim on the 14th and 15th of the month Adar (February–March), and both it and the year of Parikshit were years ruled by the position of the sun in Taurus, for it was Arjuna or Phalgun, the young bull-god grandfather of Parikshit, who followed the latter in his year's wanderings as the sun-horse round the four points of the compass—that is, round the Indian garden land of the north, the threshing-floor of the barley sun-god of the eight-rayed star.²

This sun-god, who was to die again on reaching his watery home in the last of the stars of the Ten Kings (Skat in Aquarius), also in his annual course reproduces the connection already shown between the sun-god of the year of thirteen lunar months, the year of eleven months of the gestation of the sun-horse, and the constellation Pegasus. For when he enters on his journey as an infant, guarded by the moon, from the first star of the thirty—the star Skat in Aquarius where his predecessor died—he next comes to that of Pegasus.³ It is called in Akkadian Likbara, meaning the striped lion or dog. In order to understand clearly the meaning of this constellation, we must turn to the genealogy and history of the Licchavis, the Hindu sons of the Akkadian Lig or Lik. They have now become the representatives of the warrior class who call themselves Singh. This is the Hindu form of the Assyrian Sin, the moon-god, from which the Indian people get the name of Hindus or Sindhus, and Singh, means both the moon and the lion. These people, under the Eastern name of Licchavis, are known in Buddhist and Jain history as the ruling tribe of the confederacy of the Vajjians, who claimed to represent the tribes from which the twenty-four Jain Tirthākaras, or prophet

¹ Hewitt, *History of the Physicians*, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April 1896, pp. 361, 362. *Mahābhārata Ashvamedha Parva*, lxi.–lxxi pp. 170–183.

² See the course of the sun-god Parikshit and Arjuna described in my *History of the Physicians*, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, April 1896, p. 363.

³ R. Brown, jun., F.S.A., *Tablet of the Thirty Stars*, Star II. *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, February 1890.

makers of pilgrimages (tirtha), were descended. These Jain Tirthākaras trace their descent from Rishabha, the bull, the constellation ruling the sun years succeeding that of Aries the Ram-sun, and Rishabha, called the Koshali or Man of Kush or Koshala in the *Lives of the Tirthākaras*, is said to have been born in Ikshvāku bhūmi, the land of the Ikshvākus, of Mara-devi, the mountain (mara) goddess, and his father Nābhi, the navel, the fire in the centre or navel of the altar guarded by the three enclosing sticks of which I have spoken. He is said to have belonged to the Gautama clan of the god Hari,¹ whose name is a form of that of the goddess Shari, as Hindu is a form of Sindu. Hari, in his subsequent form of Krishna, the black antelope, is the twin brother of the mountain goddess called in the Krishna myth Durgā. The mother land of Ikshvāku bhūmi is that of which the capital was Pātāla, the ancient seaport on the Indus, now called Hyderabad in Scinde, and about 115 miles from the sea, so that it must have been, as I have shown, a seaport about 9000 years ago, that is, about 7000 B.C.² This confirms the evidence which I have taken from other sources to prove that the Jains, whose first most holy settlements are in the West of India, on hills at Pālitana and Gurnar, both hills in Kāthiawār, and at Mount Abu in Guzerat,³ were an immigrant tribe from the North-west, who, after they had conquered India as the Ikshvākus, became the chief tribe of the Vajjian confederacy, ruling the country to the north-east of the Ganges, now occupied by the districts of Gorakhpore, Busti, Chumparun, Mozafferpore, Durbhunga, and North Bhagulpore, and also a large part of Nepal. It was they who in their eastward march made their eastern holy shrine on Mount Paris-nath, the Mount Mandara of the Kishikas, and they also, as sons of the bull and the god Hari, boast Kushika descent. That they were the maritime trading race who carried on foreign trade from the ports of Pātāla and Kāthiawār, the ancient representatives of the present trading Kathi, who show by their name that they are Hittites, is proved by the name of their holy hill Paris-nath, which means the lord of the traders (parāris). They were a people who looked on their supreme god as dwelling on the high hills, the mountain-cloud-goddess Shar. They came from the land of Shushan, ruled by the Kushika snake-god called there Suai-Nag, the land of Esther and Haman, and ruled not only the north-eastern country, where they are placed as the Vajjians in Buddhist history, but also the whole land to the west of the Ganges, and it was on that river that they founded the city of Patna, which, in its native name Patali-putra the son of Pātāli, shows the Western origin of those who built it. Their central capital was first at

¹ Jacobi, *Jaina Sūtras Kalpa Sūtra*, "Lives of the Jinas." *S. B. E.*, vol. xxii. pp. 281, 282, 218.

² Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. p. 141.

³ *Ibid.* pp. 323-329.

Kesh-ambi, the mother city (ambi) of the sons of Kush, at the junction of the Jumna, or river of the Twins, and the Ganges, the eleventh of the nineteen Ikshvāku capital cities whose names are recorded in Buddhist history; and secondly, at Kashi, now Benares.¹ The second tribe forming the united Vajjian confederacy were the Mallis, or mountaineers, the predecessors of the Licchavis, whose rule extended from Mallarāshtra, the kingdom (arāshtra) of the Mallis the modern Mahratta country, Malabar, and Multan, once Malli-tana, the place of the Mallis in the far west, to the eastern land of Nepal. They represented the union of the first swarms of northern invaders who formed the Khati, or joined races of Northern and Southern stocks, and who were the Vaishya or trading villagers who, according to the Hindu *Grihya Sūtras*, first lighted the household fires and made the god of the Takkas, Agni Vaishvānara, the parent god of the land.² They were the race who wore goat-skins on the day of their initiation into manhood, and whose priests, like those of the Akkadian goat-god Uz, were clothed in goat-skins. The name of Vajjians, assumed by these united tribes, means the sons of a tiger, for Vajji is a form of the Pali Vyaggho and the Sanskrit Vyaghra, a tiger, and they are the people of the north-east of India who are said in Varahāmihira's "Geography" to have tiger faces, that is, to be descended from the tiger. The name is, in short, that originally taken by the earliest Turanian immigrants, the Gonds, the first settlers from the North-west, in the land of Koshala, the name given to the whole of Northern India by the Gautama, or sons of the bull, the Jain Rishhabha. These Gonds traced their descent, as we have seen, from the two tiger wives of Pharsi-pen, their female (pen) trident (pharsi), and it was they who called the country, which received its name Koshala from the later sons of this bull, Gaura or Gauda, a name which still survives in native parlance as an old name of Northern Oude. This was the land of Gaurs, or sons of the wild cow, the Gaur or Indian bison still found in the Indian hills, and it was to this stock that the band of the Semites called the sons of Leah, meaning the wild-cow, the Hittite, Lo., belonged.

We thus see that the name of the striped dog or lion, the tiger, was one originally given to the constellation Pegasus by the Turanian races who invaded Mesopotamia and India as the sons of the revolving Pole Tur and the household fire. Also that the tiger-star parent of the first reckoners of time by the year of four seasons, was made, as we see in the history of the Buddha, the heavenly horse, Pegasus, by the Ikshvāku, sons of the sun-horse. It was on the back of and under the guidance of this parent-horse, called Kan-

¹ These are given in the *Tika* or abridged commentary on the *Mahavanso* by Mahanāmo, extracted from the Thibetan Kangyar by Cosma de Koros, *Journal Royal Asiatic Society*, August, 1833.

² Oldenburg's *Grihya of Gobhila*, l. 1, 15. *S. B. E.* vol. xxx. p. 15.

tika, or the thorny one, the sun-horse encircled by its rays, that the Buddha started on the second stage of his existence when he left his father's court to attain salvation. He had till then, like the sun-god of the Akkadian year of thirteen months, been under the care of his aunt Gotami Pajāpati, the moon-goddess who had, when time was reckoned by lunar phases, taken the place of the earlier year-star Prajāpati (Orion) and it was when he started, like the Akkadian dolphin-sun on his career as an independent sun-god tracing his course through the stars, that he sought the aid of his servant, the Home constellation, to direct him on his journey. It was thus that the constellation obtained the name of the Servant, which was given to it in Egyptian astronomy, and which is thus indubitably shown to be derived from India.

But the descent of the sun myth of the eight-rayed star from India is also proved by another line of argument, for we have seen that Parikshit, the circling sun, was descended from the blade of Kusha-grass placed in the womb of his mother, Uttarā the Pole-star goddess, by Ashvatthā-man. An exactly similar story is told in the family legend of the Baidyas, or Caste of the Physicians, of the birth of Dhanv-antari, the inward (antari) flowing stream (dhanv), the river of intellectual thought, who was the first reputed father of the tribe. His mother was Bir-bhadra, the blessed (bhadra) wood, and her son was begotten by the tuft of Kusha-grass placed in her lap by Gālava, the pure Soma, and also the parent-tree now called Lodh in Bengal (*Symplocos racemosa*), from the bark of which a red dye is made, and this furnishes the red powder thrown by women over their male friends at the annual Huli festival held at the vernal equinox. It was from this powder that the red and coloured *confetti* thrown in European carnivals originated. This son of the red bark, the sun-physician, is also the sun-god of the Soma sacrifice of the sons of the sun-horse, the eight-rayed star. For the sacred fire on the altar, the Nābhi, or parent navel fire, of the Jain Tirthākara, is kindled by a fire-drill made of the wood of the Ashvattha-tree, the wood parent of Parikshit, turned in a socket made of the Khadira-tree (*Acacia catechu*), a wood yielding, like the Lodh, a red dye, and also the valuable medicinal drug called catechu. This tree, which furnished the eleven sacrificial stakes to which the victims offered to the eleven months of generation of the sun-horse were tied, is the Bir-bhadra, or blessed wood, the fire-mother of the physician sun-god.

This was the first birth of the Buddha, who came into the world as the Osadha-dāraka, medicine (osaddham) child, holding the sandal-wood, the medicine of healing, in his hand, which Sakko the rain-god had given him. He as he was born took seven steps forward as the god of the lunar-solar year of thirteen months and 364 days.¹

¹ Rhys David's *Buddhist Birth Stories*. The *Nidānakathā*, pp. 67, 68.

This year of thirteen months, originating with the year of the Indian sun-physician, is the year of the sons of the date-palm-tree. This is in the *Mahābhārata* said to be the cognizance of Bhishma, and also of Vala-rāma, the revolving (vala) Ra, son of Jama-agni, the twin fires, and of Rohini the red cow star Aldebaran in Taurus, who is also called Hal-ayudha, or he who has the plough (hal) for his weapon. And this plough, the sign of the Plough constellation Nagur, is also the cognizance of Shalya the sal-tree, the father of Madri, the mother of the two younger Pāndavas,¹ whose father was the Ashvins. It was also from the sal-tree in the grove of Lumbini, held by his mother, that the Buddha, the sun-physician, was born. It is the leaf of the date-palm-tree, the mother tree which is in the Zend ritual of the Haoman or Soma sacrifice, tied round the sacred "Baresma" or rain-wand, and it is split into six thread-like ribbons, which are wound three times round the Baresma, which was also made of twig of the date-palm,² thus showing that the Baresma was a direct descendant of the Hindu Prastara, used as the priest's magic wand. This when used for the New and Full Moon sacrifices was made of three bundles of Kusha-grass, and in the ritual of the Soma sacrifices of the Ikshvāku race the grass used was the Ashva-vala, or horsetail sugar-grass (*Saccharum spontaneum*), the parent grass of the sons of the sun-horse and the sugar-cane (ikshu).³ The three bundles of grass of the Hindu and the three bands of palm-tree fibres of the Zend rain-wand denote the three seasons of the year, and the six ribbons into which the palm-tree is split denote the six days of the week of the year of the sons of the palm-tree, the week by which the year beginning with the six days' Trikadruka festival of the three trees (dru) of Ka was measured,⁴ the six days of the world's creation. This year of the sons of the palm-tree and the sun-physician is also the year of Tamar the date-palm-tree, the second wife of Judah. Judah is the fourth son of Leah, the wild cow, and his name means "praised." He is thus the Jewish equivalent of the Hindu Narū-shamsha, which means Praised of Men. Narū-shamsha in its earliest form is called Nābhā-nedishta (nearest to the navel), and it means the fire on the altar, which was in the *Rigveda* (x. 61) said to be produced by the union of Prajā-pati (Orion) with his daughter. In another myth in the *Āitareya Brāhmaṇa* this union is interpreted as the union of Prajāpati, the deer, the deer sun-star Orion, with his daughter Rohini, the star Aldebaran, who became afterwards the red cow, but

¹ *Mahābhārata Bhishma (Bhishma Vadha) Parva*, xlvii. p. 165. *Shalya (Gud Ayudha) Parva*, xxxiv. and cx. pp. 138, 233. *Drona (Jyadratha-Vadha) Parva*, cx. p. 297.

² West's *Shāyast-la-Shāyast*, chap. iii. *S. B. E.* vol. v. p. 284, note 1. Darmesteter's *Zendavesta Fargard*, iii. *S. B. E.* vol. iv. p. 22, note 1.

³ Hewitt's *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. pp. 164-166; essay iv. p. 406.

⁴ Hewitt's "History of the Week," part i., WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July 1897, pp. 18-21.

was in the early sun-myth the doe. It was from their union that Vastosh-pati, the lord of the house (vastos), the household fire was born.¹ This god of the sacred fire Narī-Shamsa, or Vastosh-pati, becomes in Zend theology Nairyō Sangha, the renowned of men, the Yazad of royal lineage, who guards the seed of Zarathustra. In the Hebrew myth the union of Judah, whose first wife was Shua, the bird, with his daughter-in-law Tamar, the date-palm-tree, results in the birth of the twins, Zarah (the red twin) and Perez (the breach), the Hebrew equivalent of the Phœnician Tirhatha, the cleft or pool, and it was from Perez that the sun-god Ram was born.²

The sun-physician, the son of the palm-tree and dolphin, becomes in Greek Apollo, the dolphin sun-god born at Delos, while his mother was grasping the date-palm, and he is the god called Apollo Paian, Apollo the healer. Another form of the myth is that of Bellerophon, the rider of Pegasus, the sun-horse, who belongs to the series of Phœnician Corinthian myths, beginning with that of Melikartes the Phœnician Melkarth, the lord (malik) of the city (karth), the sun-god and equivalent of Archal the conquering sun, the Greek Herakles. Bellerophon is, as M. Bérard has shown,³ the Phœnician sun-physician Baal Raphon, or the god of health, who killed the Chimaera, the lion-headed sea-serpent, from whose back a goat's head sprang. This is the era of time computation by the serpent-constellation Draco and the goat-god of generation, which, as I have shown, preceded the year of thirteen months of the sun-physician, and in which, also, the year of the lion of the tribe of Judah ruled by the constellation Leo was reckoned, which I will describe presently as the first stellar year of four seasons.

In this long survey of the ages of time computation I have proved in this and the preceding chapters that the first sun-god worshipped was the god who died, and revived each year at the winter solstice. He was the Phœnician sun-god Archal, who was also the god Melkarth, called Melikartes at Corinth. His death and re-birth were celebrated in the Isthmian Games held in the month of Poseidon, beginning at the winter solstice, and the festival of Asclepios, the first sun-physician god, the prototype of Bellerophon, was held nine days after. Asclepios was an Indian god to whom the cock, the Indian bird sacred to the Munda sun-god Sri Bonga was offered, and his Indian origin is also shown in the snake twisted round his left hand. He also, like the Indian sun-physician, was the son of the growing plant, for his mother was Koronis, the goddess of the flower-garland, making in its successive blossoms the varying changes of the year, and his father was the Arcadian Is-chus, the Sanskrit Ishā, the

¹ Hewitt's *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay iii. p. 169; vol. ii. essay vii. pp. 18, 19.

² Gen. xxxviii. 1; 1 Chron. ii. 5-10.

³ Bérard, *Origine des Oultes Accadiens*, chap. ii. "Les Déeses," p. 116; chap. iv. "Le Dieu Fils," p. 258.

upright pole or axis of the heavenly oil-press. This was the revolving fire-drill which took the earth round with it in its revolutions, and these were caused by Ixion, the brother of Koronis, who was bound by the god Hermes of the Pillar (ἑρμα) by his hands and feet to the wheel of the heavens, the constellation Draco, which he turned round. Both Ixion and Koronis were the children of Phlegyas the fire-god, and the age of the myth is clearly that of the rule of the alligator constellation Draco, a conclusion confirmed by the fact that the goat, who was then the god of time, is sacred to Asclepios. The prize given to the victor at the Isthmian Games was a wreath of pine leaves, the tree sacred to the Phrygian mother goddess Cybele, and that which gave birth to the young Dionysos, who became the god Iacchus, the barley-born god of the Eleusinian Mysteries, for the pine-cone seed of the pine-tree formed the top of his Thyrsus, or Magic Wand, thus showing his descent.¹ Ixion, or Akshivan, the man or turner of the axles, was the constellation Draco.

It is the ages ruled by the goat and alligator, succeeding that of the sun-god of the winter solstice, which I have traced in the last two chapters, and have shown how in the days of the rule of the Kāthi or Hittites, the joined races, time was traced by the ten lunar months of gestation which gave birth to the sun-god conceived at the autumnal equinox, when the year of all the corn-growing races of South-western nations began. This was followed by the eleven months year of the sun-horse, which again gave place to the lunar-solar year of the ploughing races, the year of thirteen lunar months, which was the year of the Hindus and Jews, and also of all the sons of the date-palm tree, sacred to the Babylonians. This was the parent tree, which showed by its adoption as the national birth tree an advance in practical botany beyond that made by the worshippers of the growing cutting of the fig-tree, the sign of Phœnician Eshmun, the Greek Dionysos, and the Indian god Sek-Nag. For the date-palm-tree can only be fructified by applying the pollen of the male tree to the pistils of the female. This impregnation of the female tree by the male is frequently depicted in Assyrian sculptures, and the great religious importance attached to the rite shows that it was one venerated by a race of scientific gardeners who had learnt to improve plants by creating hybrid species. This was a marked stage in human civilisation reached by the united intellects of the Northern and Southern races joined as the Khāti or Hittites. They were born, as the *Brāhmanas* tell us, from the marriage of the seven stars of the Great Bear to the six stars of the Pleiades,² the two, 7 + 6, producing the year of thirteen lunar

¹ Bérard's *Origine des Cultes Accadiens*, chap. iv., "Le Dieu Fils," pp. 255, 256. Hérit, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay ii. pp. 82-86.

² Eggeling's *Sub Brāh.* ii. 1, 2, 4. *S. B. E.* vol. xii. p. 238.

months. This was the offspring of these two constellations, just as the year of eleven months was the child of the two constellations of the eleven stars of the Great Bear and Pegasus.

The origin of the whole upward movement of growing civilisation is to be traced, as it is in Hindu literature, to the god Agni, the Lithuanian Ogun, the god to whom the Gayātri metre of eight syllables is dedicated, the god of the revolving eight-rayed star. He was the god of the household fire of the Finn-Basque marrying races, extinguished at the end of each year and relighted from the national fire-altar, kindled by the national and village priests by the interfriction of the two pieces of the national fire-parent, the fire-drill and fire-socket, made of the two national parent trees, like the Hindu *Pepul* (*Ficus religiosa*) and the *Khadira* (*Acacia catechu*). This is a custom which survives among the Dakota, meaning the leagued or allied American Indians, who make their fire-socket of the ash, the Ygg-drasil, or mother ash-tree of the Edda, and the cottonwood, the *Simul*-tree (*Bombax heptaphylla*) of India. It is called in the *Rigveda* the Shalmali-tree, and the car in which the Ashvins drew the sun-maiden to be married to the moon-god is said (*Rigveda* x. 85, 20) to have been made out of the Shalmali and Palāsha (*Butea frondosa*) wood, a passage which seems to refer to a time when the fire-parents were the *Simul* and *Palāsha* trees, which last tree I have shown to be the sacred tree of the Mundas. As the wedding car of the Ashvins was drawn by asses, the fire ritual of the age in which the fire-parents were made of *Palāsha* and *Simul* wood must be one preceding the worship of the sun-horse, when the *Pepul* and *Khadira* woods were used. This time was apparently that when the agricultural aptitude of the irrigating Kauris or Kurmis led to the cultivation of improved varieties of cotton, followed by an increase in the activity of the weavers and an improvement in their methods.

This was followed, as I have shown, by a large exportation to Babylon, and also doubtless to Egypt, of the cotton goods known as *Sepat Kurri*, or cloth of Kur. It was these cotton weavers who called the Indian mother-stars the Pleiades, named *Amba*, or the mother in Tamil, the *Kritikas* or spinners. And it was this dominant weavers' guild who, according to the historical legends of the sacred land of Mathura, the rubbing (math) fire-god, made *Kirat* or *Kīrthidā*, the spinning Pleiades, the mother and *Vrishā-bhāna*, the rain- (varsha) god, the father of *Rādhā*, the mother or giver (dha) of *Rā*, the sun-god. In the story of his birth, the home of *Rādhā* is *Barāna*, the hill of the rain-god (bar) and her lover, the father of the sun-god, was the bull-god *Nanda*, dwelling on the adjoining hill of *Nand-gānw*. The two lovers, the bull, the male moon-god of the marriage hymn of the *Rigveda*, and the sun-maiden daughter of the rain-cloud, and the Pleiades, the spinners of time, met in the grove

common to both their hill villages lying in the valley between them. This grove is called Sanket, the place of assignation, and is the survival of the village grove, in which, before the days of matrimony in India, the women of one village who could not, according to the national laws, be the mothers of children begotten by men of their own village, met the men of an adjoining village. These latter came, as they do still where the relics of the custom are preserved, at the invitation of the women, and these invitations were issued at the times of the seasonal dances, when, as is still the custom among the Kols, the women made rice-beer for their partners to drink. The whole story is a clear survival of old customs which have now all but disappeared. It finds a counterpart in the story of the birth of the Buddha, who is, as I have shown, and will prove hereafter still more clearly, a direct descendant of the sun-god Rā, the god born, like the sun-god of the year beginning with the autumnal equinox, as the son of the black-bull Pūshan. The grove where the Buddha was born as the son of the mother sal-tree, and where almost certainly, according to the original story, the marriage of his mother Māya, the goddess Māgha of the Māgha dances, was consummated, is the grove of Lumbini, common to the villages of Kapila-vastu and Koli.¹ This last village shows by its name that it was a village of the Kol or Mūnda mountaineers, the races called by the Buddhist history the Mala. It was the mother-village of Māgā, where the Māgha dances of her parent tribesmen were regularly celebrated, as they are still in all Kol villages.²

The people who framed these stories as part of their national history were the ploughing Nāga races, the sons of Nagur, the plough; and it was to them, who were then, as they are still, particularly careful about their land measurements and the preservation of their boundaries, that the cross of St. George, the Ge-ourgos, or workers of the earth, the ploughing god of Asia Minor, was especially sacred. This, now enclosed in a square, is the sign of the mother earth in Chinese, and it was marked by the Roman augurs who took their divinations from the entrails and flight of birds, on the "templum" or holy field in which they performed their ceremonies. It is also, with its equal arms pointing to all parts of the compass, the sign of the year of four seasons measured by the equinoxes and solstices—the year begun at the autumnal equinox by the growing ploughers of Asia Minor. It was the sign which the emigrants from India took with them to America, whither they were brought, as they say, by a fish-man, the Indian fish sun-god

¹ Rhys David's *Buddhist Birth Stories* *The Nidāna katta*, pp. 65, 66. Hardy's *Manual of Buddhism* (p. 147) gives the name of the village called Devidaha as given by the god in the *Nidānakatha* as Koli.

² Hewitt's *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. essay v. pp. 451-453.

Matsya, whose birth I have described. It must have accompanied them, together with the parent fire-pole made of the two parent trees, and survives in the national fires of the Dakota Indians. Wherever they establish a permanent village the lighting of the village fires is entrusted to the priests of the peace section called Tsishu, and to those of the war section called the Panhuka, and seven fires ~~are~~ lighted on the west side of the sacred circle by the Tsishu priests, and seven or six fires on the east by the Panhuka or war priests. The god invoked by the Tsishu priest is the buffalo-god, the parent buffalo, still sacrificed yearly in Central India at the Dasaharā festival of the autumnal equinox as the ruling god of the dead year. The eastern god of the Panhuka priests is the deer sun-god, the deer sun-star Prajāpati of India. In each fire the sticks were laid in the form of St. George's cross in a circle, the circle of the apparently revolving sun of the year of four seasons.¹ This cult of the mother village fire is shown by the number of fires, either fourteen or thirteen, to be connected with the reckoning of time by lunar periods and the year of thirteen months, and it must therefore have reached America from India during the rule of the maritime Nāga kings and their successors, the Ikshvākus. The ritual is the one which originated with that of fire-worship in the volcanic districts of Mount Ararat in Asia Minor, the birthplace of St. George's cross, where the fire-worshipping Finns made the household mother the priestess of the family fire, who sacrificed to it, as Finn mothers still do, at the Joula, or feast of the winter solstice. It was they who united with the Indian farming races, made the fire-goddess of the hearth, the Greek Hestia, the Latin Vesta, the goddess whose shrine was placed in the centre of every village, under the shade of the village grove, where the four cross roads sacred to the mother goddess Hekate met. This meeting point at the four cross roads was a survival from the original T cross with its three arms, the three seasons of the year; and it was to the north of this point that in the early ages the village grove, overshadowing the central village hearth, stood. This T cross was also the sign of the fire-drill turned by the ruling god of the south, called in the ritual of the Soma sacrifice Pururavas, or the eastern roarer, the thunder-god of the rainy season brought by the south-west wind. The block or socket on which it was turned is called Urvashi, the ancient (Ur) rain creatrix (vashi), the cloud-mother Shar. She is also called in the *Rigveda* Mātariśhvan, the mother of the dog (shvan), the fire-dog or wolf of light, the father-god of the early twin races, and the hunting dog of the northern hunters, which still survives as the sacred dog of the Parsi fire-worshippers.

¹ *Publications of the Bureau of Ethnology, American Smithsonian Institute, vol. xi, Dorsey's Study of Siouan Cults, pp. 381, 528-529. Hewitt's Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times, vol. ii, essay ix, pp. 237-240.*

The cross thus formed was the hammer called Mjolnir, the pounder of Thor, a form of Donner or thunder, and it is in Egyptian hieroglyphics the sign of Pthah, the creating god, whose name is derived from the Hebrew root patah—to strike. It was also called the cross of St. Anthony, the saint who, as Leland has shown in his *Etruscan-Roman Remains*, is believed to be the special guardian of the household fire and also of the pigs, the animals sacred to the early fire-worshippers.¹ The Latin cross, which is a combination of the T cross and of that of St. George, is that formed with the three upper arms of equal length, and the fourth, or southern arm, twice as long as the others. This, in which the handle of the hammer pierces through the overlying earth, is the hammer of the Egyptian god Ptah,² and also of the dwarf gods of the Phœnicians and Egyptians, called the Pataikoi, or striking gods. It is the cross of the first dwellers on the Tortoise-earth, sons of the world's tree, the Ygg-drasil of the Edda, which grows on the top of the world's mountain Asgard, while its roots pierce down into the land of Nifheim, the home (heim) of the primæval mist (nifl or nebel). This last, the land of winter and the frost giants, is the underground region, where the Urd, or pillar fountain of the turning pole of the south, nourishes one of the three roots of the Ygg-drasil, or tree of life. It is this dark region which in the Akkadian cosmogony forms the interior of the upturned tortoise-boat of the mother-earth, of which the upper surface is turned to the overarching sky, the home of the Æsir, the Hindu Asura, the gods of the soul (asu) of life. It is this belief which is set forth in the cosmogonic story of the Mexican Sias, which tells how Ut'set, the mother goddess of the corn-growing race, children of the sun-deer, made her way up with them from the nether world, flooded by the incoming ocean, on which the tortoise-earth rested. They, together with the bag of stars carried by the Beetle—the sacred beetle or symbol of life to the Egyptians—reached the upper earth by the help of the river reed, which pierced the overarching crust.³ This is the Mexican counterpart of the parent reed growing at the source of the mother rivers, from which were born the Kushite kings of this tortoise-earth, whose history subsequent to the formation of this conception I have told in this and the preceding chapters. It was this reed, the growing tree, the parent of the Latin cross, which passed, as we shall see, through the stage of being the shaft of the gnomon-pole, to become the turning-year cross made to revolve from the north in the mother earth by the lunar crescent forming its arms, and thus generate the heat which made plants to grow. In the myth of Ixion and the Hindu turning constellation Simshumā, the shaft or drill-pole of the cross was turned

¹ Leland's *Etruscan-Roman Remains*, pp. 288, ff. 252

² Goblet d'Alviella, *The Migration of Symbols*, pp. 14, 15.

³ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. II. essay ix. pp. 358 f.

by the year goat of the axle (aksha) called Ixion, or Akshivan, bound to it by his hands and feet by Hermes, the god of the Gnomon Pillar, and, as we are told in the *Vishnu Dharma*, the hands, or eastern arm, were the twin stars Gemini of the Ashvins, and the feet the western stars Aryaman (Boötes), with its star Arcturos. This is the constellation of the treading star oxen (bos), who tread out the year's grain when driven round by the star Arcturus, the warder (ouros) of the North Pole star (arktos).

J. F. HEWITT.

THE GRANDEUR AND THE DECAY OF WAR:

A REVIEW.¹

Cum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia propter
Unguibus et pugnīs, dein fustibus, atque ita porro
Pugnabant armis, quae post fabricaverat usus ;
Donec verba, quibus voces sensusque notarent,
Nominaque invenere : dehinc absistere bello,
Oppida coeperunt munire et ponere leges,
Ne quis fur esset, neu latro, neu quis adulter.

HORACE (*Sat.* I. 3).

As was to be expected from one so well known as a writer on Political Economy, M. de Molinari has treated the subject of his essay essentially from an economical point of view. Do not let us be misunderstood; we are not blind to the higher humanitarian and ethical sentiments with which the author is penetrated; but in the work before us he seeks to show, and we believe does show, in a conclusive manner, that war under the present conditions of civilised life is, if not an unmixed evil, yet a very great one. We say under the present conditions of civilised life advisedly: for the author himself devotes the first part of his book to an elaborate exposition of the views which are so neatly expressed in the words of Horace which we have quoted above. Public war, like private war, has played its part in the history of man and the evolution of civilisation. Private war has long since given place to the arbitrament of courts of law; its suppression was one of the earliest successes of a constituted central authority against universal lawlessness; the duel has entirely disappeared from our own country, and though it exists in many foreign States, it is permitted and regulated by the courts of law themselves, and its aid is invoked only in questions touching personal honour. In the nature of things public war is not so easily suppressed. The combatants are powerful, not weak. There is no constituted central authority to enforce its will. There is no court through which that will might be expressed. But it is with the

¹ *Grandeur et Décadence de la Guerre.* Par G. de Molinari. Paris: Guillaumin et Cie.

intention and hope of aiding in the constitution of such an authority and such a court that M. de Molinari has written this book. We heartily concur in his object, and hope it may have the success which it deserves.

M. de Molinari's main propositions are two: Firstly, that in the early period of man's history war was the *only* means by which could be obtained that security for a population and for the fruits of its industry without which civilisation was impossible of growth; that at this period—the period of its grandeur—it was a force working for good, and tending to the accomplishment of man's higher destinies; and, secondly, that security from barbaric invasion—from the “folk-wanderings” of the dawn of history—having now been assured, there is no place for war, no need for it, that is to say, amongst the nations of civilisation themselves, and exception always made of the necessity for repeated displays of force upon the confines of civilisation, where it may be at any moment necessary to stem an incursion from the realms where barbarism still holds sway. Now it is much less difficult to uphold the first of these propositions than to prove the second, and to our mind M. de Molinari has failed so to prove it. He takes one test, and one test only, by which to determine the righteousness of a war, that is, “material benefit.” But it is quite impossible to reduce everything in this life to a matter of pounds, shillings, and pence; there are considerations in the public life of States and communities, as in the private life of individuals, which cannot be solved by the very simple process of striking a balance between profit and loss. To emphasise his contention that all the wars of the present century have been for the separate interests of the ruling classes, to the detriment of the general body of the communities engaged, he cites, amongst others, the war of Italian independence. He means, of course, the economical detriment; he means that, calculating the income per head of population, Italy is perhaps worse off than before the war. But surely he cannot be serious in urging this view, and in forgetting that there are other mainsprings of action, even in a nation, than considerations of economic gain. Surely a sense of national unity and a hatred of foreign yoke are as praiseworthy, as essential to progress and civilisation, as any such considerations.

But the most valuable and suggestive part of M. de Molinari's essay consists not in his historical survey of the benefits and evils of war, but in the practical suggestions which he puts forward as to the way in which it may be superseded, at any rate among the countries claiming Western civilisation and having a place in the forum of international law. The proposals are not original, but none the worse for that, and are treated with much clearness and conviction. He points out that war is detrimental to neutrals; that neutrals have in consequence, on many occasions, made their voices heard as to the way in which hostilities between any two or more Powers should be con-

ducted ; that they have, on more than one occasion, actively intervened. "Why not," says M. de Molinari, "constitute a league of neutrals, which would be enabled by the very display of overwhelming force to compel subjection to its awards?" Would it? That is the whole question. England and France have both, single-handed, at the end of last century, defied most of the Powers of Europe united. War cannot be prevented by force ; we must wait till public sentiment is convinced that its interests—moral, material, intellectual—all lie in the direction of peace.

E. AUSTIN FARLEIGH.

THE BERLIN TREATY EXAMINED IN THE LIGHT OF 1898.

THE prolongation of the Eastern Question, and its recrudescence in all its new phases, reminds us that it is just twenty years since the Great Powers of Europe, represented by their plenipotentiaries and high officers of State, after the war between Russia and Turkey, sat in solemn conclave in Berlin, with Prince Bismarck for president, and arrived at certain results and bases of agreements, subsequently formulated as "Articles," which established the new conditions under which the Turkish Empire was to be delivered from the imminent peril of complete dismemberment at the hands of Russia, and have once more, by the consent of Europe, a rehabilitated existence, and which salvation, wisely or not, was chiefly the outcome of the policy of the British Government of the day and the acts and declarations of such Government both before and in the course of such Congress.

The Russo-Turkish war had, be it remembered, terminated in the "Treaty of San Stefano." By that treaty Turkey had been compelled to saddle herself with a debt, by way of indemnity to Russia, of 1,410,000,000 roubles. The subsequent process of dismemberment, in the course of the treaty-making, of some of her provinces in Asia and in Europe had enabled Turkey to reduce the debt by 1,100,000,000 roubles; there remained a debt of 310,000,000 roubles to be discharged to Russia. Turkish finances, even before the war, disclosed utter bankruptcy. It was necessarily worse after the war. Lord Salisbury then declared that if this indemnity were to be convertible into further territorial concessions England would resist it altogether. Russia, however, declared that in no case would she demand further territorial cessions on account of the indemnity, nor would she claim any preferential security over the previous creditors (the then holders of Turkish bonds). The claims of Russia, nevertheless, took precedence of all the necessary expenses of Turkish military, naval, judicial,* and general administration, with such margin as such a corrupt Government must leave for peculation by its officials in its collection.

On the return to England of the Prime Minister (Lord Beaconsfield) and Lord Salisbury, at the close of the Berlin Congress, it was

announced "that peace (the peace not of Russia and Turkey alone, but of Europe) had been secured with honour." Peace had certainly been secured at a cost and on certain conditions, and it was no doubt believed that some "honour" did attend its attainment, for chiefly was it not the outcome of the attitude of England towards Russia at a moment when it seemed that the "Sick Man" was on his back and the Russian vulture was hovering over him with beak and claws ready to tear him limb from limb? In the interval of twenty years since the Berlin Treaty became an accomplished diplomatic fact much has happened, and probably now, in 1898, one of the chief actors in that great settlement (the Marquis of Salisbury himself) may well doubt whether, on the whole, the policy of England in opposition to the Russian demands as formulated in the preliminary treaty of San Stefano, which had for its motive the resuscitation of the Turk and the preservation of the Ottoman Empire, was after all justified. The preservation of useful life, whether individual or national, should always be of humane solicitude. The death, and even annihilation, of some Governments would at times seem to be the only drastic remedy for the evils they foster and perpetuate.

There is no disgust so emphatic as that which a patron or protector feels for him who at one time excited his interest and pity, enlisted his aid, and secured by such patron's influence an indemnity from impending peril, when such an one disappoints hope, breaks faith, disregards promises and compacts, and finally compromises his benefactor. Such is the relation of England to Turkey, and so much so is it that now, looking back to the events of 1877 and 1878, the Berlin Treaty and what led up to it, in the light of the subsequent conduct of Turkey as regards her treatment of her Christian subjects in Europe and in Asia, and particularly her Armenian subjects scattered throughout the whole Empire, even Lord Salisbury, whose great influence and diplomatic tact was enlisted in Turkey's behalf in 1877 and 1878, is at last constrained to admit, not so long ago, in a review of the policy he then conducted and as the result of twenty years of its trial, "that we had put our money on the wrong horse." It was indeed a good phrase in which to sum up the net results attained (after such stupendous efforts on our part)—the broken promises and discarded obligations to secure which so much had been done by us in our efforts to stimulate into something like virtuous life the atrophied Turk, so bent on national death. Was this not a practical admission by him of something like a wrong policy throughout the contentions which sought to modify the Treaty of San Stefano (the Russian idea) into the terms of the Berlin Treaty (the British idea)? If not, it comes indeed very near to such admission.

It can never be forgotten that the whole policy of the Government of the day was the subject of much adverse criticism and animad-

version on the part of some men who might have been charged with a too pronounced Russian proclivity, who, it was thought, from a party point of view, were too ready to back up the Russian claims against the British, and for no other purpose. Perhaps the time has come when, as now in this paper, some of those views and criticisms can be more justly appraised and valued. Where they were extravagant or mistaken they can be rejected as unfulfilled prophecies of evil; but, so far as they were just warnings of a fatal policy which would reproduce trouble and disappointment, they should be re-read and should serve to assist in a full comprehension of the present position of Eastern affairs and act as a warning for the future. One of the most prominent of such adverse critics was the Duke of Argyll. In the whirligig of time, the Duke has lived long enough to find himself, if not an enthusiastic supporter of the present Government, yet, by reason of the Liberal break-up under Mr. Gladstone (the then champion of the oppressed nationalities of Europe and Asia), a Liberal-Unionist, and as such a general supporter of the present Government, at whose head is the Marquis of Salisbury, one of the chief actors in that same Congress of 1878 and a then defender of the integrity of the Turkish Empire, or, as he would doubtless rather state it, of "British interests," as against the machinations of Russian intrigue, diplomacy, and aggression.

As is well known, the Duke of Argyll has, with his wonted force, learning, and vehemence, recorded his criticisms of the whole Eastern policy of the Beaconsfield and Salisbury administration in a work of two volumes, entitled *The Eastern Question*, dealing with the whole policy as it affected the East, "from the Treaty of Paris (1856) to the Treaty of Berlin (1878), and up to the second Afghan War."

No doubt it must be admitted from the point of view of a dissentient critic of that policy, it is a masterly effort. All the learning and research of the Duke in the arts of diplomacy covered by the periods indicated are brought into full play in what he meant to be a scathing denunciation of the Conservative foreign policy throughout. Unhappily, like all such party efforts, it loses critical force just by so much as it is a too bitter impeachment, not of the policy itself, but of the motives which influenced and directed such policy, and the conduct of the two plenipotentiaries in their efforts to secure such terms as were secured by the Berlin Treaty. Nevertheless, there is much in it which with advantage may be now re-read—at least the chapters on the preliminaries towards the Congress and on the Berlin Treaty itself. And much of it may well be reproduced, by way of aid in the determination of some of the following questions: Aye or no, is the policy of 1898 to be a continuation of the policy of 1878? Are "British interests" still opposed to the dismemberment of Turkey and the full protection of

the Christian subjects of the Porte? To what extent have we been responsible (by the line the British Government then took in resisting Russian proposals of safeguards towards the autonomous Christian subjects) for the continuance of the mischiefs which the Powers were anxious should be put an end to by the Berlin Treaty, but which mischiefs still remain? At all events, with the aid of this able criticism of the Duke's we can earmark very easily the events which led up to the treaty, trace also the conflicting lines of the respective policies which commended themselves to Russia and England, determine what was contended for and what in the result was "given and taken" in accomplishing a *modus vivendi*, and to which the sanction of the other Powers—Germany, France, Austria, and Italy—was ultimately obtained. We shall then know better what were the claims made, what the diplomatic barter, what the consideration for agreements were, and whether the considerations and obligations have or have not been fulfilled in whole or in part.

A short *résumé* of the events leading up to the treaty will clear the ground. The atrocities in Bulgaria by the Turkish Government had been the actual (or, at least, had been made) "the *casus belli*" by Russia. The Turks, as usual, in the war itself fought with all the bravery of religious fatalism, but at length there came Plevna. Russia was at last victorious in Asia, and on October 15, 1877, the Turkish army was overthrown in the Aladja Dag with a great rout decisive of the fate of a campaign. Plevna soon after was invested, Kars fell in November, and on December 10 the redoubtable Osman Pasha marched a captive out of the lines of Plevna after a most heroic defence.

It is here desirable to recall the events which rapidly succeeded. The victorious Russians pushed their advantage to the utmost. The protection of Bulgaria and the Christian subjects of the Porte against Turkish ferocity and misgovernment was the pretext for the war. Before the conclusion of the Armistice in July 1877, General Gurko had dashed across the Balkans into Southern Bulgaria, but with a force wholly insufficient to occupy or to hold the country. Its only effect was a raid, which first compromised the native population, and was succeeded by a retreat, which left the inhabitants to the vengeance of the Turks, for on July 31 the cities were retaken by Sulieman Pasha and given over to plunder. Adrianople and Philippopolis became scenes of carnage and blood. By January of 1878, however, the tide had turned, Sofia had been taken by the Russians, the Balkans had been turned and traversed, and the Russian army was pouring down their southern slopes upon the Roumelian plains. It was in the face of all this that the Turks had the effrontery to appeal to Europe in these words for help and intervention: "In the name of humanity we appeal to the Great Powers, and to their feelings of justice." The answer of Germany was

decisive. "The German Emperor declines to accede to the Sultan's request for mediation." The appeal to England was not in vain, however; we had great interests at stake, negotiations were set on foot, and bases of a peace armistice ultimately settled. Russia had declined armistice without such bases. Russia had by this time entered Adrianople, and was threatening Constantinople itself. The British Government then imposed a barrier to the occupation of Constantinople:

"In the contrary event," the Cabinet said, "the Queen's Government must hold themselves free to take whatever course might appear to them necessary for the protection of British interests."

The Russian Government's reply was:

"His Majesty the Emperor considers that it is his right and his duty to oblige Turkey to conclude a solid and real peace which shall offer effectual guarantees against the return of the incessant crises which disturb the peace of Russia and that of Europe. These crises can only cease with the state of things which gives rise to them. The whole of Europe has recognised the impossibility of allowing them to continue. It is with a view of finally putting a stop to them that his Majesty the Emperor has taken up arms and exposed his people to heavy sacrifices. These sacrifices borne with devotion render it all the more the duty of his Majesty not to stop before having achieved a result which shall preserve Russia from the renewal of similar trials, which shall satisfy her Christian feelings, guarantee her repose, and at the same time consolidate the peace of Europe."

But whilst the negotiations proceeded, and mutual guarantees were exchanged by Russia and England, against the direction of military operations on Gallipoli by Russia on the one hand, or its occupation by England on the other, there was alarm in England as to the terms or bases of peace Russia was demanding of the Porte, and what might be involved in such bases. Russia had advanced to Demotica, and fears were entertained that by the occupation of Keshan Gallipoli would be cut off from direct communication with the capital. It had already been intimated to the Emperor of Russia "that, in the opinion of her Majesty's Government, any treaty concluded between the Government of Russia and the Porte affecting the Treaties of 1856 and 1871 must be an European treaty, and would not be valid without the assent of the Powers who were parties to those treaties." The occupation of Demotica, however, brought matters to a head. On January 23, 1878, Admiral Hornby received secret orders "to sail at once for the Dardanelles and proceed with the fleet now with him to Constantinople." He was to abstain from taking part in the contest between Russia and Turkey, but the water-way of the Straits was to be kept open, and in the event of tumult at Constantinople, he was told "you are to protect life and property of British subjects." Admiral Hornby obeyed; then his orders were countermanded, and he was directed to anchor

at Besika Bay. He did so. The cause of this revoke was the actual receipt by her Majesty's Government on January 25 of the actual bases of the Russian peace armistice.

For the furtherance of my present purpose, which is to contrast what were these bases with the Articles of Agreement which, after the Congress, and such pressure as England directed against Russia, were finally arrived at, it is desirable to set them forth. They were, as communicated by Count Schouvalow, as follows :

"(1) Bulgaria within the limits of the Bulgarian nationality not less than that of the Conference, to be an autonomous tributary principality with a national Christian government, a native militia, and no Turkish troops except at some points to be determined.

"(2) Independence of Montenegro, with increase (of territory) equivalent to the military *status quo* : the frontier to be decided hereafter.

* "(3) Independence of Servia, with rectification of frontiers.

"(4) Independence of Roumania, with sufficient territorial indemnity.

"(5) Autonomous administration sufficiently guaranteed to Bosnia and Herzegovina.

"(6) Similar reforms for the other Christian provinces of Turkey in Europe.

"(7) Indemnity to Russia for the expenses of the war in a pecuniary, territorial, or other form to be decided hereafter.

"(8) Utterior understanding for safeguarding the rights and interests of Russia in the Straits.

"These bases being accepted, a convention, an armistice, and the despatch of plenipotentiaries to develop them into preliminaries of peace."

It was with these bases before them that the British Government, on January 28, 1898, obtained the vote of credit for six millions. Here is the criticism of the Duke of Argyll upon these proceedings in Parliament, which, without comment, will show how the critics of the then policy regarded it :

"The speech of the Minister on this occasion marks an important change in the attitude and language of the Government. Hitherto . . . since the beginning of the war, it had been declaring that nothing but danger to British interests, as those had been defined in the despatch of May 6, 1877, would induce England to interfere in the contest which had arisen. It could not be alleged that any one of those interests had been as yet endangered. The Queen's speech eleven days before this date had expressly said so. . . . Since it could not be alleged that Russia had attacked, or was likely to attack, any one of the British interests of which she had been warned—since it was not even thought worth while to move up the fleets to defend the water-way of the Straits—it was necessary for the Government to take up some new ground on which to rest a vote for warlike preparations. Accordingly it was now discovered, apparently for the first time, that the British interests which had been defined in May were by no means the only interests which might induce the Queen's Government to interfere. Suddenly the Cabinet had opened its eyes to the fact that the Russian terms of peace, although not touching any one of those interests, would be very damaging to the interests of Turkey."

Now, as to whether this was a just view of the then policy of the Government will be clearer when we come to see what ultimately

were the demands of Russia as they were afterwards put before the Congress, and what claims the British Government did, in fact, urge in opposition thereto. To what extent was the policy which ended in the Treaty of Berlin a protection of "British interests," or a pure determination to continue at all risks the maintenance of the old traditional policy (now admitted by all to be wrong)—viz., "that the interests of Turkey were the interests of England, which required that the *status quo* should be upheld at all hazards"? The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in his speech, attacked the formation of a Bulgarian province. He referred to the fact that it crossed the Balkans, and would extend probably to the *Ægean*. It was not objected to on the ground of the effect it might have on the Greek question—that is to say, the impending liberation of the Greek Christian population.

"It was," says the Duke of Argyll, "the effect of the new Bulgaria, not on any section of the subject population, but on Turkey, that he dwelt exclusively. It amounted, he (the Minister) said, to a dismemberment of Turkey."

So again of the war indemnity:

"In regard to this, also, he pointed out how it might be worked to the detriment of the Ottoman Empire. Against all these results it might be necessary for England to contend in the coming Congress—and it was useless to contend in congress unless she was prepared to contend in arms. The Government, therefore, desired to enter into congress 'armed with the strength of a united nation,' having for its great end and aim to support Turkey, and to save her from dismemberment."

Such, then, was the principle enunciated by the British Minister, and the six millions were voted. Then it was, if at all, "we put our money on the wrong horse," and so we find on January 31 that the protocols were signed at Adrianople, and orders issued for the suspension of hostilities to all the armies both in Europe and Asia. Then followed the Treaty of San Stefano of March 3, which, after all, was itself only a treaty preliminary between belligerents, and subject to a conference of the other Powers of Europe. But still, an article thereof (Art. 6) did actually provide for the extent and constitution of the new Bulgaria. It included a portion of the coast line of the *Ægean*. It left out Salonica and Adrianople, passing both of them to the north. Speaking generally, the Bulgaria of the previous conference had extended from the Danube to within a short distance of the Mediterranean. The Bulgaria of the preliminary Treaty of San Stefano extended from the Danube to the seashore, and gave a maritime outlet in the Mediterranean to the new province. The new Bulgaria, moreover, was to have something more solid and definite than administrative autonomy. It was to be erected into a tributary principality with a Christian Government.

and a national militia. By Article 7 the prince was to be freely elected by the people and confirmed by the Porte, with the assent not of Russia, but of all the European Powers, and no member of the reigning families of the great European Powers was to be eligible.

It is now desirable, having before us what Russia demanded, to pass quickly over the prolonged negotiations for a Congress between March 1878 and June 13 of the same year, when the Congress did assemble in Berlin. Lord Derby resigned the office of Foreign Secretary on March 28, immediately after the communication of the Treaty of San Stefano to Parliament, and Lord Salisbury assumed the reins of the Foreign Office. His celebrated Circular Despatch to all the Ambassadors and Ministers of England at the Courts of Europe was issued on April 1, 1878. It claimed and defended "the right to have the whole Treaty of San Stefano to be equally and unreservedly subject to discussion, and with a view to show that almost every stipulation in it did more or less affect European interests," and that "every material stipulation which the Treaty of San Stefano contains involves a departure from the Treaty of 1856." This determination to have free and unreserved discussion of every part of the Treaty of San Stefano was enthusiastically backed up by the voice of the nation.

Now, at length, on June 13, 1878, the Congress did meet at Berlin, and on June 17 the order of the day was "the question of Bulgaria." It cannot be overlooked in this connection that, in the interval between his accession to office as Foreign Secretary in March and the Congress in June, Lord Salisbury (no doubt so as to limit and to focus the real and vital issues which he regarded as proper to be debated upon by all the Powers in congress) had actually entered into what the Duke of Argyll calls a "secret agreement" with Russia. It might more charitably have been described as "memoranda, of preliminary heads, of agreement to be confirmed in congress by and with approval of other Powers." It would, at least, be used by England as bases for acceptance of certain points of agreement, and so avoid repeated protocols in congress, leaving open for future discussion points of divergence. However, the Duke of Argyll did not so regard the terms agreed "behind (as he says) the backs of the other Powers," and in no unmeasured terms condemns both the proceeding and the policy. One clause is enough to show the view taken by him as to its terms. After severely criticising the article in which the aims and intentions of the English Cabinet in the coming Congress were stated, he says :

"There are other clauses of this secret agreement to the aim and object of which no just objection can be taken. If they had been made subjects of consultation with the other Powers of Europe, as matters of common understanding before going into congress, there would not be one word to

say against them. But, on the other hand, the whole scope and purport of the transaction was to represent England as bent on setting up again, as far as she could, some semblance of a real Turkish Empire in Europe; and yet, at the same time, as yielding up almost everything which was really substantial in the fatal demands which the military success of Russia had enabled her to enforce upon the Sultan."

It would be impossible within the limits of an article to follow all the tortuous proposals and counter-proposals made in or towards the modification of the Treaty of San Stefano as disclosed by protocols and debate. It is enough now to sum up some of the results. First take the war, the Treaty of San Stefano, and the secret agreement; those results are stated to have been as follows:

In Europe, England assented to Russia acquiring (1) retrocession of her old Bessarabian frontier reaching to the Danube; (2) destruction of all great fortresses on the southern bank of that river.

In Asia, England assented to (1) permanent acquisition of Kars and of Ardalian, with adjacent territories; (2) acquisition by Russia of Batoum, which, it was declared by Russia, would be a free port, but which Russia has since found it convenient to make, and in breach of good faith, a close port and a naval station, Lord Beaconsfield having gone so far as to say as to this concession of Batoum "as a free port" that "he regarded as a happy idea the transformation at the conclusion of a great war of a disputed fortress into a free port, and into a commercial dépôt for all nations."

So far that is what Russia got. Now, what did England secure? Let the Duke of Argyll say:

The concessions, he says, made to England were only these: (1) Russia conceded that Bulgarians south of the Balkans should not enjoy the privileges of the newly created principality of Bulgaria. England contended for the Ottoman Government successfully the largest occupation of the country by Turkish soldiers. (2) The control by the Ottoman Government over the native militia, despite the risks involved. (3) The excepted provinces of South Bulgaria. England asked to be called "Eastern Roumelia," and secured the right to have quartered Turkish troops in any part of the sea or land frontier of the new Roumelia. (4) Exclusive nomination by the Sultan of all the officers, even of its own militia—qualified by this, that the Sultan shall take into consideration the religion of the population. (The preliminary agreement with England had been less favourable to the Turk, for it only secured the appointment of the principal officers by the Sultan.) In objection to the Russian demand for restriction of the military force and the appointment of a European Commission charged with the duty of fixing on the frontier points to be occupied by the Ottoman army, Lord Beaconsfield urged "that it had been agreed unanimously that the Sultan, as a member of the political body of Europe, was to enjoy a position which should secure

to him the respect of his sovereign rights." This was compromised by three terms: (a) the Sultan was not to employ Bashi-Bazouks; (b) the soldiers not to be billeted on inhabitants; (c) soldiers not to stay in the interior of the province when on the way to frontier garrisons. On these terms Russian opposition to the unlimited power of the Sultan gave way to the British demand. Bismarck had thrown his vote with Russia, and voted for Varna being included in the principality of Bulgaria. Lord Salisbury offered to include it in new Roumelia, as the next best thing to its retention by the Turks. (5) The provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina to be occupied and administered by Austria-Hungary, despite the protests of Turkey.

Then as to Greece. There was much debate as to the terms on which Greece should be admitted to the Congress. The provinces of Thessaly and Epirus were those which Greece most desired to have and which were the provinces which most desired to be joined to Greece. There was too the question of Crete. Russia professed to be ready to protect the Greek Christians under Ottoman rule. By the previous "secret agreement" it had been assumed that Greece was not to be allowed to acquire either Thessaly or Epirus. England proposed that the Greeks should be admitted to the Congress to deliberate where their interests were at stake, and Russia cordially accepted. Russia declared that she was in favour of securing the liberty of both Slavs and Christians. She had always contemplated extending as far as possible to the Greek provinces the advantages which she might succeed in winning for Bulgaria and would willingly adhere to any proposition which might be laid before the Congress in favour of Epirus, of Thessaly, and Crete, whatever may be the extent which the Powers may desire to give to the advantages which may be reserved for them. But Lord Salisbury demanded the presence of the Greek representatives also, when provinces like Macedonia and Thrace were to be dealt with, as well as when the frontier provinces were dealt with. The Treaty of San Stefano had stipulated for Special Commissions with the natives of these subject races, which should have the duty of elaborating in each province the details of the new arrangements and the result to be submitted to the Porte, which was to consult the Government of Russia before putting them into execution. Lord Salisbury proposed to substitute "the European Commission" for "Government of Russia," and this was accepted. But again Lord Salisbury obtained a further definition: "the Commission" was to be entrusted or charged with the duty so to examine when the Sublime Porte requested it. Lord Beaconsfield explained in justification of this:

"That the intention of that high assembly was not, as had been erroneously supposed, 'to proceed to the partition of a worn-out State;' on the

contrary, it was to strengthen, as the high assembly had done, an ancient empire which it considered essential to the maintenance of peace. The handing over of Bosnia and Herzegovina to Austrian rule was not deemed a 'partition.' It was a territorial arrangement specially devised for the purpose of preventing partition."

Such then was the *modus vivendi* secured by the treaty as regards Bulgaria, the creation of East Roumelia, the cession of Bosnia and Herzegovina, of Batoum, the fate of the frontiers of Thessaly, Epirus, and the Greek provinces. But there were, it was afterwards found, other bargains out of congress, and now we touch the line of policy which the critics of the Government of the day most assail—the further secret bargain between England and Turkey known as "the Anglo-Turkish Convention." Space will not permit of an examination into its preliminaries. What was the bargain in result? The negotiation leading up to it had for its object that England should guarantee Turkish territories in Asia against further Russian aggressions. The price to be paid was (1) Turkish assurances for good government of her Asiatic provinces; (2) to assign to England the island of Cyprus. By June 4, 1878, this was definitely arranged. The Convention of Defensive Alliance between England and Turkey "engaged England singly and alone to defend the whole of the Asiatic dominion of the Sultan against the demands by Russia of territorial cession," and, more, "to defend Turkey against any attempt at any future time by Russia to take possession of any part of Asiatic Turkey." What did Turkey undertake? It was this. "Turkey promises to England to introduce necessary reforms into the government and for the protection of the Christians and other subjects of the Porte in these territories."

But the convention does not say what such reforms were to be. They were to be agreed upon later by the Powers.

Here surely then was the fatal and final phase of all that had preceded. The government of those same provinces had been declared for over twenty years then to have been one of corruption and barbarism, reducing some of the fairest regions of the earth to desolation. "We did not ourselves secure the proposed reforms," it was complained by the Duke of Argyll, "by possession, but rely on promise; but to secure the performance of such promise, as to which past history might well make as sceptical, we secure no guarantee."

But now we come to the case of the *Armenians*, and which is the matter which in view of the recent massacres may well arouse interest as to what Russia then proposed and what England did as regards their security and the freedom of these people from oppression. First of all, under stress of the Treaty of San Stefano (by Article 16) the Porte undertook to Russia to carry into effect without further delay the improvements and reforms demanded by local requirements in the provinces inhabited by Armenians, and to guarantee their security from Kurds and Circassians. Armenians

are scattered over nearly the whole of Asiatic Turkey. Such an engagement as the above would give Russia a separate right of interference in the case of misgovernment of the country. But what of the "Anglo-Turkish Convention," designed to protect Turkey and to resist Russia in such an event? The article (16) of the Treaty of San Stefano still held good as regards Russia; but the English Government secured by another article at Berlin the right to every one of the signatory Powers in such event to intervene.

Unlike the Treaty of Paris, there is no article making the Porte the executrix of her own promises, and, failing, the right to each separate Power to execute them if mediation failed. So it is well said, there being no such article in the Berlin Treaty, notwithstanding the onerous obligations England has undertaken to and with Turkey, we have acquired no exclusive right over the Asiatic dominions of the Sultan. What is the result? All the Powers, and Russia especially, have secured by treaty, each and all of them, "a right to call upon Turkey to reform the administration of those countries." That is all. How this right has been used, and with what poor results, in recent years, notwithstanding the brutal massacres of the Christians, is now a matter of history. The recent critics of the policy of the present Government (at whose head is now the Marquis of Salisbury, who was so important a factor in the structure of that same treaty) were loud in their demands for British interference, even at the cost of war, in the interest of the oppressed Armenians, and impatient with the negotiations and delays that the Concert of Europe involved in its endeavour to secure such reform and protection as they should have. But they failed to appreciate the exact relation of England to the Porte, and also to the other Powers, as regards such exclusive and individual control by reason of the Treaty of San Stefano. It was not secured by England by the Treaty of Berlin. Such interference without the concert of all the Powers would have been a violation of the express terms of the treaty and inevitably have led to war. Our hands were held. Lord Salisbury's amendment of Article 16 of the Treaty of San Stefano, as regards the Armenians, is embodied in Article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin, and is exactly the same, except that there was added, "It (the Porte) will periodically make known the steps taken to this effect (*i.e.*, reforms, &c.) to the Powers, who will superintend their application." And so upon this point the criticism of the Duke of Argyll may well be read now with interest in the face of what impotency such a stipulation has disclosed in and by recent attempts to demand fulfilment by the Porte of its obligations. "No machinery or organisation of any kind is provided for the joint performance by the Powers of this duty, or for the joint exercise of the rights which it involves. It annihilates at a blow any pretence of independence as belonging to the Sultan over the administration of his

Asiatic provinces. It gives a right of direct interference to all and to each of the Powers. It leaves this right to be fought about or arranged over by the local consuls of the great Powers, or by their respective ambassadors at Constantinople, or by the Cabinets of each according as occasion may arise for any one of them to take advantage of this provision of the treaty."

But the critics of the policy of 1898 are not entirely against the treaty as it finally emerged from the hands of the diplomatists. Here are the Duke's own words :

"Looking now at the Treaty of Berlin as a whole, we cannot be too grateful for some of its results. In the first place it was a public confession on the part of the English Cabinet, that a war with Russia was not justifiable for the purpose of preventing her from securing the substantial gains she had won for herself by war in the Treaty of San Stefano. In the second place, it was a public confession that such a war was impossible for the purpose of supporting Turkey against the main provisions secured by the same treaty on behalf of the subject populations of Turkey. In the third place, it took a long step forwards in the direction of the final partition of the Sultan's European dominions, redeeming from even the forms of vassalage the old Danubian principalities, and establishing in two other important provinces institutions which must lead to future independence. In the fourth place, it embodied in the public law of Europe the fertile principle that the Sultan is under pledge to the other Powers in respect to the good government of all the dominions that remain to him, whether in Europe or in Asia. All these great elements of good ought to be acknowledged, although, most unfortunately, every one of them has been due to the interests and to the power and the policy of Russia. On the other hand, there are some great evils connected with the treaty and the proceedings of the Congress which constitute serious deductions from the good it has effected. In the first place, it has postponed the settlement of some points which were ripe for solution, which can only be settled in one way, and which it is only too probable cannot now be settled without another war. In the second place, it clogged the institutions of autonomous administration which it professed to confer upon Eastern Roumelia with provisions conceived in the interest of the Turks which are incongruous and inconsistent, and are sure to be the source of future trouble. In the third place, the treaty has left the joint and several rights of the signatory Powers in respect to the protectorate over the subject populations of Turkey in a state of utter confusion, without the indication even of any methods of operation, or any provision whatever against the intrusion of selfish and exclusive action as opportunities may arise. In the fourth and last place, and this, perhaps, is the crowning evil of all, the whole proceedings of the Congress have exhibited the English Government as jealous of and hostile to the growing power and advancing freedom of the Christian populations, and Russia as the only Power which is heartily on their side."

Such of the events of 1878 only have been recapitulated as to enable us to bring the considerations of this paper to a point. What, it may be asked, is the gain at the present time in thus recording those events? The answer is short, and is a fair conclusion. Twenty years ago, when Turkey was practically at the feet of Russia, naturally intense feeling was aroused, and probably otherwise sound

judgment was clouded. Diametrically opposite views on Eastern policy were upheld and contended for, not always reasonably. The intense sentiment of co-religions stimulated an enthusiasm which might then have swept the Ottoman rule out of existence, and have almost reconstructed the map of Eastern Europe and Western Asia. On the other hand, too much disbelief in the *bona fides* of Russia and her aims towards freeing the Christian populations and securing for them real safeguards which could, in certain events, be enforced, was the dominant policy which was at the basis of all that England did, and led her to do more, in the result, for the perpetuation of the very evils she deplored, than was ever anticipated, and led her also to neglect those safeguards which, in common with the other Powers, she might have established and found means for enforcing. In short, England, it must now be admitted, is responsible for having secured a further long lease for Ottoman rule, without (to use a legal phrase) securing a sufficient "power of re-entry and eviction on breach of covenants and conditions by the lessee." How this has operated we now see. The possibility of bad faith all round should have suggested greater caution in procedure and more stringent security. If there was "peace with honour," yet the policy which resulted in the cession of Batoum to Russia, which dictated the terms of the "Anglo-Turkish Convention," which made England responsible for the maintenance of the Ottoman Empire in its integrity, and for such obligation secured for us the island of Cyprus, with so little behind it to support our rights of interference, was, after all, a mistaken policy, which at length its responsible authors may well admit. But what is the lesson to be learned? What is to be the policy of the hour? We have helplessly beheld the recent Armenian massacres throughout the Empire of Turkey. We have certainly again helped with other Powers to intervene once more on their behalf, but how ineffectively, and with what little assurance of its final success! We are still the witnesses of disturbances on the frontiers of such autonomous States as we assisted to establish and delimitate. What are the weapons in our hands by which they can be prevented? We have just had thrown upon us the herculean task of separating Greek and Turk from a devastating war, which threatened to engulf all Europe; and now we may behold the devastation of the plains of Thessaly and the Epirus, which had passed under Greek protection. We have still with us the Cretan imbroglio, which is as far off settlement as ever. Why is all this misery perpetuated, but for the simple reason that there has ever been, and, alas! still continues to be, an unwholesome jealousy between the several ruling Powers of Europe as to the balance of power in the East, which gives to the Turk a security for his misdeeds which is a shame to the civilised world?

J. EDMONDSON JOEL.

A STIRRING SCENE IN THE LONG PARLIAMENT.

TOWARDS the close of November 1641, Charles I. had returned from Scotland, whither he had gone to seek support from his northern subjects in his opposition to the reforming zeal of the English House of Commons. Jealous as he was of his Prerogative, he must have cursed in his heart that luckless hour in which he assented to the far-seeing resolution of the Parliament that it could only be dissolved by its own consent.¹ One by one the kingly privileges of the Tudor despotism, with the exorbitant claims put forth by his father, to which he clung as his inalienable birthright, were wrung from him by an equally sturdy and stubborn House of Commons. To these stout opponents of regal tyranny he had been compelled to yield up his most devoted political servant, the mistaken but noble-minded Earl of Strafford, whom, to his imperishable disgrace, he had sacrificed to his own danger and to that of his wife. The same fate daily threatened his spiritual and ecclesiastical guide, William Laud: the one was already beheaded, while the other was calmly and patiently awaiting his trial and enduring much petty persecution in the Tower of London.

In spite of these indications of the popular temper, the King, weak and hesitating as he was by nature, never abated his determination to govern absolutely as his predecessors had done; but he had neither the masterful tact of Elizabeth of immortal memory nor the shrewd common sense of his father—and his vain attempt cost him his life. Irresolute where he ought to have stood firm, but obstinate where it would have been wiser to have given way, he was utterly unable to shape the course of that great struggle for supremacy between himself and the Parliament which ended so fatally for him, but which has been the source of most of the liberties of the present day. To make matters worse, he was under the unwise domination of a beautiful and high-spirited but supremely imprudent queen. A Frenchwoman by nationality and a Romanist by religion, Henrietta Maria had little if any sympathy with the people of England, whom she regarded as neither more nor less than the

¹ Clarendon, *History of the Great Rebellion* (1701-1703). Vol. i. pp. 204, 205.

goose which laid the golden eggs of revenue. Thus neither she nor her doting husband made the slightest attempt to understand the aspirations of their subjects: so long as the taxes, legal and illegal, were paid, matters went comparatively smoothly in the political world; but in the no less important sphere of religion there was a perpetual ferment, largely due to the persecuting zeal of Laud. When louder murmurs of resistance than usual reached the Court the Queen was always ready with one ill-advised solution of all difficulties: that foreign aid should be called in to reduce the murmurers to silence. By such follies, to which the King was only too willing to listen, she brought disaster upon herself and destruction upon her devoted husband.

Charles had returned from Scotland, having completely failed in the object of his visit, as any one but himself and perhaps his sanguine adviser, Lord Digby—that imprudent son of a prudent sire¹—could have foretold before he went northward. Endowed as he was with a zigzag intellect, he was apt to spin diplomatic cobwebs of so slight a texture that they ensnared no one but himself; so it was his melancholy fate to play the dual part of the spider and the fly at one and the same time, and that is a part which no man can play with equal satisfaction to himself and the onlookers. To add to his troubles, natural and acquired, he had always two kinds of dangerous favourites in his Court, the one of which, like the notorious Will Murray, Groom of the Bedchamber, could not keep a secret if they would, while the other would not if they could. To the latter class belonged the Countess of Carlisle, who had formerly attached herself to the Earl of Strafford as the ablest of Charles's Ministers, but who after his execution devoted herself to John Pym, by whose intellectual gifts she was captivated. Perrinchief gives what is probably the true reason of her change of front, when he describes her as "having lost the confluence of servants with her beauty, and seeking now to prevent a solitude by politic ministries."² That Pym took advantage of her zeal for giving information is unquestionable, but it is almost certain that at this point their relations ended. By the irony of fate, the Queen blindly trusted this great lady, of whom she had made a special confidante; and so Pym had a continual stream of information, and that from the fountain-head. Nay, it speaks much for his wise moderation that he kept so many of these State-secrets entirely to himself.

Such was the position of affairs which Charles found awaiting him on his return from the north, nor could his warm welcome from the City blind him to the unpalatable fact that another assault was about to be made upon the Church and his Prerogative. On

¹ i.e., the Earl of Bristol, who conducted the negotiations for the Spanish match with as much skill as was possible.

² *Life and Works of King Charles the Martyr* (1687). P. 21.

December 1 the Grand¹ Remonstrance was presented to the King, which contained an exhaustive summary of the disastrous course of his unhappy reign. To this, as was his wont, Charles returned an evasive answer, and from this time he began to form that fatal plan of arresting the five members whom he rightly regarded as ringleaders in the attacks upon his feeble attempts at policy. From some source, probably from Lady Carlisle, Pym had heard that the Queen had devised a plan of coercing the Parliament with the aid of an Irish army, a device which led to a threat of impeachment of her Most Sacred Majesty.² There had long been indications³ that the Parliament was beginning to recognise that the impetuous temper of the Queen was the source of many of their misunderstandings with the King. While Charles had been away on his bootless errand in Scotland, an ill-defined rumour reached England that he was plotting an invasion thereof with a Scottish army. In the meantime a conference was being held at Kensington, at which members of both Houses were present: here the Earl of Newport, irritated by the rumour, is reported to have exclaimed, "If there be such a plot, yet there are his wife and children," by which he meant to imply that it was always possible to use these most precious hostages for the King's good behaviour. When the matter was brought before the Upper House, the Earl roundly denied the use of any such words, which denial was reported to the Queen, to her contentment, as it was said.⁴ So little satisfied was she in reality, that she evidently complained to the King on his return home, and on December 24 he asked Newport "whether he heard any debate at Kensington about seizing the Queen and her children." The Earl at once made answer that he had heard no such thing: whereupon the King replied, with a significant look, "I am sorry for your Lordship's ill memory." Whatever may be the truth of the original story, there can be no question that Charles's suspicions were aroused that his wife and children were in danger, and he at least showed that his memory was better than that of Newport by dismissing him from his post in the Tower of London.

When, then, the King heard that the Parliament had had the hardihood to threaten his beloved Queen with impeachment,⁵ Newport's words would recur to him and all his suspicions would be confirmed. The next thought in his heart was how to avenge himself of this last and highest flight of insolence and at the same time insure his wife's safety; danger to himself he seldom feared, but the peril of those whom he loved best on earth provoked his lively alarm. Who

¹ Husband's *Exact Collection* (1642). Pp. 3-24. (N.B. The Remonstrance was not printed till Dec. 12, 1641.)

² *Ibid.* p. 68.

³ *Rushworth's Abridged* (1708). Vol. iv. p. 229.

⁴ *Exact Collection*, p. 68.

⁵ Clarendon, *Great Rebellion*, vol. i. p. 327. (*Cf. id.* pp. 202, 203.)

suggested the plan which he ultimately adopted does not appear. Dr. Bates,¹ physician to Charles and his son, asserts that it was the offspring of some of the Privy Council; but the very helplessness of that ordinarily somewhat helpless body would have prevented them from making a suggestion so harebrained and so utterly unwise. Clarendon² is, therefore, probably right in giving the honour of the invention of this wild scheme to Lord Digby, whose sanguine, unreflecting mind was quite capable of so great a piece of folly. "Why," said he in effect, "should not the impeachers themselves be impeached?" Nay, he went so far as to suggest whom he would have his master impeach; his choice fell upon Lord Kimbolton, afterwards the fighting Earl of Manchester, in the Upper House; and upon John Pym, Denzil Holles, John Hampden, Sir Arthur Hazlerigg, and William Stroud, or Strode, in the Commons. Now, at this time the House of Lords was playing the part of mediator between Charles and the Lower House; hence, any attempt to override its privileges was suicidal policy on his part, and Digby's sage scheme of impeachment succeeded in uniting the two Houses in opposition to the King.

That the House of Commons, at least, knew of the plan some little time before its attempted execution is certain; but how, or through what channel, information reached its members is less sure. Clarendon, who was one of them and was therefore likely to know, says: "It was generally believed that the King's purpose of going to the House was communicated to William Murray, of the Bedchamber, with whom the Lord Digby had great friendship, and that it was discovered by him."³ Perrinchief, on the other hand, maintains that the traitors were the Marquis of Hamilton and the Lady Carlisle.⁴ Probably there is truth in both of these suggestions, for it is at least possible that there were more traitors than one in the Court. But, by whatever means they were informed, Pym and some others of the Commons knew their threatened fate, and thus they were prepared to defend themselves against any such wanton breach of their privileges.

Nor can it be said that, had his plan in the first instance been a wise one, Digby's choice of victims was without foresight. Lord Kimbolton, though by no means a man of first-rate ability, was a zealous and valiant Presbyterian, a ready speaker, and gifted with that practical moderation which must always carry weight in an assembly like the House of Lords. John Pym was the most far-sighted politician of his day, and withal one of the most moderate and statesmanlike men in the House of Commons. He spoke with

¹ Bates, *Motuum Nuperorum in Anglia* (translated by A. Lovel, 1685), p. 34. Perhaps by some he meant one, i.e., Lord Digby.

² *Great Rebellion*, vol. i. p. 282.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Life and Works of King Charles the Martyr*, p. 21. He only says "a great Court lady," but Lady Carlisle is meant.

weight and a calm dignity that insured him an attentive hearing; and when we realise 'how much information of the intrigues of the King and Queen with Scotland, Ireland, and foreign nations he kept to himself, and how much premature irritation he thereby spared the country, we cannot but admire his large-minded prudence. Indeed, had Charles been wise enough 'to have made a friend of John Pym, he would in all probability have saved his own life and his people much bloodshed. Denzil Holles was one of the heroes of the Parliament of 1628-1629, who, when Speaker Sir John Finch sought to leave the chair before putting a strong resolution of Sir John Eliot's, had joined Benjamin Valentine in holding him down, with the fierce expression, "God's wounds, Mr. Speaker, you shall sit till we please to rise."¹ Of John Hampden it need only be said that he persistently refused to pay Ship Money, and that, though he rarely spoke in the House, he made a deep and abiding impression upon the men of his day. Sir Arthur Hazlerigg and William Strode were strong and sturdy partisans of the Parliament as against the King. Such were the men of whom Charles was anxious to rid himself, for they stood in the way of his favourite theory of absolute monarchy, and it does not seem to have occurred to him that it was possible to convert them into friends by endeavouring to understand and fall in with their honestly-conceived schemes for the good of the nation. In his own view he was the only man in his three kingdoms who was capable of deciding what was good for his subjects—nay, his was alone the right of making such decisions; and so he undermined his throne and achieved his ruin.

On Monday, January 2, 1641-2,² the Houses were sitting at Westminster, as usual consulting about the state of the nation, when Sir Edward Herbert, the King's Attorney-General, entered the Lords' House, and, saying the King had sent him, proceeded to read the Articles of Impeachment against Lord Kimbolton and the five members. These were seven in number³—namely, these: i. That they have traitorously endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws and government of this country, and deprive the King of his legal power, and to place on subjects an arbitrary and tyrannical power. ii. That they have endeavoured, by many foul aspersions upon his Majesty and his Government, to alienate the affections of his people, and to make his Majesty odious to them. iii. That they have endeavoured to draw his Majesty's late army to disobedience to his Majesty's command, and to side with them in their traitorous design. iv. That they have traitorously invited and encouraged a foreign Power to invade his Majesty's kingdom of England. v. That they have traitorously endeavoured to subvert the very rights and being

¹ Rushworth, *Historical Collections Abridged*, vol. i. p. 435; Gardiner, *History of England from 1603-1642*, vol. vii. p. 68.

² Nalson, *Impartial Collection*, p. 810.

³ Husband's *Exact Collection*, pp. 34, 35.

of Parliaments. vi. That, for the completing of their traitorous designs, they have endeavoured, as far as in them lay, by force and terror to compel the Parliament to join with them in their traitorous designs, and to that end have actually raised and countenanced tumults against the King and Parliament. vii. That they have traitorously conspired to levy, and have actually levied, war against the King." In all these charges the hand of Digby can be traced, though he is represented to have said, in the midst of the excitement in the House of Lords, to Lord Kimbolton himself, "that the King was very mischievously advised, and that it should go very hard but he would know whence that counsel proceeded; in order to which, and to prevent further mischief, he would go immediately to his Majesty."¹ Whereupon he left the House, in a timely moment for his own interest, if not for his actual safety.

The moment he was gone, Lord Kimbolton rose, and the eyes of all were fastened upon him as, with quiet dignity, he placed himself in the hands of the House,² but requested, at the same time, that, as he had been publicly charged with treason, he might be suffered to make a public defence. Whereupon the Lords appointed a Special Committee to consider the manner of the threatened arrest, and to decide whether the Attorney-General had power to arrest a Peer in the Upper House.³ In the meantime they sent word to the Commons of what was going forward in their own House. As if to exasperate matters, the King had sent Sir William Killigrew and Sir William Fleming, with other courtiers, to seal up the papers⁴ and studies of Pym and his four comrades; whereupon the Commons passed an order⁵ to prevent any such illegal procedure in the future. A second order⁶ appears to have been necessary, and was issued on January 6 from the Guildhall, where the Committee of the Commons was then sitting. Furthermore, by the two orders power was given to the serjeant-at-arms to break open the sealed doors and papers, even though they were sealed by the King's command and with his seal.

When this had been done, Walter Long was sent to the House of Peers to solicit a conference with them concerning the breach of the privileges of Parliament by the King. In the presence of the common danger the two Houses were drawn together, and the request of the Lower House was readily granted. Immediately after the Peers and Commons had been thus busied in their resistance to Royal aggression, a serjeant-at-arms from the King knocked at the

¹ *Great Rebellion*, vol. i. p. 282.

² *Nelson, Impartial Collection*, vol. ii. p. 812; *Rushworth*, vol. iv. p. 235.

³ *Nelson*, vol. ii. pp. 812-814.

⁴ *Exact Collection*, p. 38.

⁵ *Id.* p. 35.

⁶ I have in my possession an *Order of the House of Commons* dated January 6, 1641-2, identical in terms with the one given on page 35 of the *Exact Collection*, with the addition, "This was read three times at the Guildhall, in the presence of many thousand citizens, with great acclamation and joy." It is therefore obvious that there must have been two orders on this subject.

door of the Commons' House, and craved permission to deliver a message from his Majesty to the Speaker. He was at once admitted, and all who were present knew wherefore he had come. He was, however, instructed to proceed with his business, and he spoke thus : "I am commanded by the King's Majesty, my master, upon my allegiance, that I should come and repair to the House of Commons, and there to require of Mr. Speaker five gentlemen, members of the House of Commons; and that these gentlemen being delivered, I am commanded to arrest them in his Majesty's name of high treason. Their names are Mr. Holles, Sir Arthur Hazlerigg, Mr. Pym, Mr. Hampden, Mr. William Strode."¹ Having delivered his message, which was heard with mingled alarm and anger, the House dismissed him without those for whom he came.

When the King's emissary had departed, the Commons fell to work to consider what they should do in answer to such a message : they were determined not to give up their members on any such charge, though brought by the King himself, and it was no light thing in those days to withstand even so weak a king as Charles. He had the prestige of a long line of kings behind him, each of whom had been accustomed to exercise a very sufficient authority over his Parliament, while they had only the justice of their cause to support their resistance to a breach of privilege. A deputation² was appointed to go to the King and point out to him that the message just received contravened the privileges of Parliament. Upon this unpalatable and dangerous errand were sent the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Falkland—that knightly hero without fear and without reproach—Sir Philip Stapleton, the shifty Sir John Hotham, and perhaps Nicholas Colepepper. While they were away, the House proceeded to its ordinary business with strained feelings and measureless indignation against the King. So keenly did the Commons feel the insult put upon them that they sent a message to the Peers praying them to join in a demand that all servants attached to the Queen should take the Oath of Supremacy, which would exclude from her train all who were Roman Catholics. They further wished the Peers to issue a joint demand with them for the dissolution of the College of Capuchin Friars at Somerset House. To the second of these demands the Lords assented, and sent messengers to the King to obtain his assent also.

Meanwhile the Commons' messengers had reached Whitehall, and

¹ For the whole of this scene see Clarendon, *Great Rebellion*, vol. i. pp. 279-287; Rushworth, *Historical Collections Abridged*, vol. iv. pp. 235-237; Whitelock, *Memorials of English Affairs* (1723), pp. 81, 82; Nalson, *Impartial Collection* (1683), vol. ii. pp. 810-832; Husband's *Exact Collection*, pp. 33-39; J(ohn) D(avies) (of Kidwelly), *The Civil Warres of Great Britain and Ireland* (1663), pp. 62-66; *Elton Basilike* (1648-9); Heath's *Chronicle of the Civil War*, sub. 1641-2; Thomas May, *History of the Parliament of England* (Oxford edition, 1854), Bk. II. chap. ii. pp. 138-143; Dugdale, *Short View of the late Troubles* (1681), pp. 81, 82; Gardiner, *History of England*, vol. x. pp. 107-151.

² Nalson, *Impartial Collection*, vol. ii. p. 814; Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 236.

seen with considerable alarm the large attendance of rowdies whom Charles thought it necessary to maintain as his guard. The King, who had already learned from his sergeant that the contumacious Commons had refused to give up those whom he had required—nay more, that they questioned his right to demand them at all—received the deputation very grimly. He would not give them an immediate answer; that was not the habit of Charles's irresolute mind. He doubtless wished to consult his wife and possibly Lord Digby. He therefore dismissed the deputation with the words, that "what had been done had been done with his full knowledge and by his commands, and that, as he had heard that the House was up, he would send an answer early in the morning."¹ With this reply the deputation withdrew, and were not able to report until the following morning, since the House had risen, but not without having first declared traitors Sir William Killigrew and Sir William Fleming, with their aids and abettors, who had sealed up the studies of the five members by the King's command.

By this time the second deputation from both Houses concerning the suppression of the Capuchin Friars had reached Whitehall, and found the King on the point of going to bed. Their reception would be no less cool than that of their predecessors, for the object of their mission would look in Charles's uxorious eyes like another personal insult to the Queen. When they were gone the King and Queen, and probably Digby, laid their wise heads together in deep and earnest consultation as to what was to be done on the morrow. A more ill-sorted trio could hardly have been found to take counsel upon any subject: the Queen was headstrong and impetuous, the King hesitating and reluctant, while Digby was sanguine and imprudent. The result of the Queen's wrath and Digby's unwisdom was such a plan as would never have commended itself to Charles had he been endowed with even a common share of prudence. It was determined that he himself, trusting in that "divinity which doth hedge a king," should go in person and fetch the guilty members. *Such was the King's resolution overnight, and we may be very sure that so long as he was awake the little termagant Henrietta Maria would use all her eloquence to fix his wavering mind.

With the morning, cooler and wiser thoughts passed through Charles's brain, and he was no longer ready or willing to go to the Parliament House on such a mission. Once more in his hesitating temper he consulted his wife; but she gave him no encouragement to change his determination. Her high spirit could brook no resistance to her own good pleasure or to her husband's commands, and she sent him from her with the savage² exclamation, "Go, you coward, and pull these rogues out by the ears, or never see my face

¹ Nalson, vol. ii. pp. 816, 817; Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 237.

² Gardiner, vol. x. p. 136.

more!" By this time it was past noon, and the Commons had held their morning sitting and had adjourned for dinner. They had sat all morning from nine o'clock, according to the righteous and sensible practice of the times, awaiting the expected thunderbolt of the King's wrathful answer to their message. They had employed their time, amongst other business, in conference with the Peers, to bring about a dismissal of the armed gentlemen at Whitehall, and the suppression of the copies printed by the King's command of the Articles against Lord Kimbolton and the five members.¹ These they summarily suppressed by an order of the House, whether effectually or not we cannot decide. The accused members themselves appeared in their places, as they had been commanded by an order of the House, and Hampden is credited with a fine speech in praise of loyalty, so little did he and his colleagues perceive at that time whither the fierce current of events and the perverse folly of the King were driving them.

When the members had resumed their seats after dinner, Nathaniel Fiennes, the son of Lord Say and Seal, entered the House; he had seen the stir of warlike preparations going on at Whitehall, and he came in haste² to warn his fellow-members. Then a second messenger was sent by Lord Essex, who had been informed by Lady Carlisle, who in her turn had been told of the King's plans by the Queen. Finally, a Frenchman named Langres, who had seen the preparations going forward, slipped through the troop, and running along at full speed reached the Parliament House long before the tumultuous retinue of the King could get well on its way. Calling out Fiennes, he told him that Charles and his guard were already on the march; whereupon Fiennes at once went in and informed the Speaker of what was about to take place. The Commons immediately ordered the five members to withdraw to a safer place; they had all felt and cheerfully obeyed the leadership of Pym, they had loved and revered Hampden, and they had no intention of giving them up on such a charge as the present. Pym and his four friends therefore withdrew to a house in Coleman Street, in the City, where they lay hidden as long as was necessary. The rest of the Commons remained in their places; their hearts filled with dismal apprehension, they wondered when the King would come, and who next was doomed to fall a victim to his unreasoning displeasure.

At Whitehall another scene was being enacted; spurred on by his wife's fierce exhortation, the King, accompanied by the Palsgrave, rushed down the steps of his palace, crying, "Let all my faithful subjects follow me!" The savage-looking procession passed along the streets, greeted by the black looks and curses of the citizens. Amongst the bodyguard was the notorious Colonel Henry Lunsford, a debauched gentleman, whom Charles had attempted to make

¹ Nalson, vol. ii. pp. 816-819.

² Gardiner, vol. x. pp. 137, 138.

Lieutenant of the Tower, and would have done so had not the Parliament represented that the Crown jewels would not be safe in such keeping. There was Captain David Hyde, whose presence was enough to damn any cause, however good; he is supposed to have originated¹ the nickname of Roundhead by saying, with much sincerity and an affected piety, that "he would cut the throats of those *round-headed* dogs who bawled against bishops." There was also Sir George Goring, whose life was a series of scenes of brutal debaucheries, and, when he had to fight, of blank and callous disobedience to his superiors in command. With these more distinguished ruffians were the wild youths of the Inns of Court, and a troop well calculated to strike terror into the minds of the Londoners as they passed along. The moment they made their appearance the citizens of Westminster at once shut their shops, as is often done to-day in those towns and villages through which hop-pickers pass. The apprentices watched the King's march with hardly concealed anger, and the whole body of the citizens was in a ferment of half-suppressed fury.

If such were the feelings of the citizens, what must the House of Commons have felt, who were not merely angered by this wanton breach of their privileges, but who were filled with natural alarm in the presence of positive danger? The King did not keep them waiting long: a sound of confused clamour arose outside of the door of their House, a hasty knock was heard, and the King and the Falsgrave hurried into the presence of the members. Charles's retinue stayed without; but the Earl of Lennox set his back against the door so that it could not be shut, in which kindly office he was aided and abetted by Captain David Hyde. There can be no doubt that the object of this manœuvre was to overawe the members assembled by the sight of the troop of armed men eagerly waiting for the word of command to fall upon them. And, indeed, the crowd was formidable to a brave but unarmed assembly; the King, a little later, or Dr. Gauden speaking in his name, tried to minimise² its numbers and its arms. The numbers are variously given as 100 gentlemen and their servants,³ 200⁴ noblemen and soldiers of fortune, 300,⁵ 400,⁶ and 500.⁷ It will, therefore, be safe to set down the number at 300. These were armed with swords and pistols, in spite of the King's declaration to the contrary; but Charles did not esteem it always necessary to confine himself within the bounds of the simple truth.⁸

¹ Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 230.

² *Eikon Basilike*, iii. p. 16.

³ Bates, *Flenchus Motuum*, p. 34.

⁴ Whitelock, *Memorials of English Affairs*, p. 52.

⁵ May, *Parliament of England*, p. 138.

⁶ Nalson, *Impartial Collection*, pp. 830, *seqq.*

⁷ *Exact Collection*, p. 39.

⁸ See *Eikon Basilike*, as above. Whoever was the author of this little book, there can be no question that it fairly represents the best side of Charles's intentions to his people.

The faces of some of these men were those of fierce desperadoes, who had learned the art of pitiless slaughter in the 'Thirty Years' War; others were debauched noblemen, who had spent their patrimony upon their pleasures. But all were animated by a common resolve to stand by the King, come what might, which was in fact the most respectable resolution which they ever formed in their career. To work upon the fears of those who could see them, some flourished their swords, and some cocked their pistols,¹ while all abused the House of Commons in the hearing of its servants. Said one, "A pox of God confound them!" "A pox take the House of Commons!" cried another. "Let them come and be hanged!" exclaimed a third. "What ado is here with the House of Commons!" shouted a fourth. But they did not confine themselves to words and grisly oaths, they violently assaulted and disarmed some of the attendants and servants of the members of the House, and gave other proofs of their truculent dispositions. Well might the author of an old pamphlet preserved by Nalson call these heroes of the hulks "damme blades":² they were that and more, they included in their ranks men that would have brought discredit upon the service of an angel, and the wonder is that so severe a moralist as Charles could have put up with them for a single moment.

While these so-called gentlemen were thus employing their leisure in disgracing their master in the ante-room, a very different and somewhat more dignified scene was being enacted within the House. The King, stepping hastily³ forward in company with his nephew only, approached the Speaker, William Lenthall, who at once rose from his seat and stood below, while the rest of the Commons stood up in their places and uncovered before the King. The first thing that Charles did was to cast his eyes towards the corner where Pym usually sat. Not perceiving¹ him, he said to the Speaker: "By your leave I must borrow your chair a little." Then seating himself, he once more looked round the House, and not seeing those upon whom he wished to lay hands, he began to speak to the members as they stood dutifully before him:

"Gentlemen, I am sorry for this occasion for coming unto you. Yesterday I sent a serjeant-at-arms, upon a very important occasion, to apprehend some that upon my commandment were accused of high treason, whereunto I did expect obedience and not a message. That albeit no King that ever was in England shall be more careful of your privileges, to maintain them to the utmost of his power, than I shall be; yet you must know that in cases of treason no person hath a privilege; and therefore I am come to know if any of those persons that I have accused for no slight crime, but

¹ *Exact Collection*, p. 39.

² Nalson, vol. ii. p. 830.

³ See authorities as given above on p. 541 for the whole of this scene, the narrative of which has been built up out of them.

for treason, are here. I cannot expect that this House can be in the right way that I do heartily wish it, therefore I am come to tell you that I must have them, wheresoever I find them."

Hereupon the King paused in his speech, and in the midst of breathless silence he again looked round the House, but he could not see those whom he sought. Then turning to the Speaker, who was standing below him, he suddenly asked: "Are any of those persons in the House? Do you see any of them? Where are they?" The Speaker, though taken by surprise, did not lay aside his wonted prudence; falling on his knees before the King, he answered in a tone of deep yet firm humility: "May it please your Majesty, I have neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak in this place but as the House is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am here. I humbly beg your Majesty's pardon that I cannot now give any other answer than this to what your Majesty is pleased to demand of me."

However much Charles might secretly admire this adroit reply, it did not content him at the present moment, and with one of his lowering frowns he said grimly: "Very well, I think my eyes are as good as another's." Then raising his voice he asked: "Is Mr. Pym here?" to which question there was no answer. "Is Mr. Hampden here?" and still there was no answer. So he asked for all the five, nor did he receive any answer. With darkling looks he continued:

"Well, since I see all the birds are flown, I do expect from you that you do send them to me as soon as they return hither. But I assure you, on the word of a King, I never did intend any force, but shall prosecute against them in a legal and fair way, for I never meant any other. And now since I see I cannot do what I came for, I think this no unfit occasion to repeat what I have said formerly, that whatsoever I have done in favour and to the good of my subjects I do mean to maintain it. I will trouble you no more, but tell you I do expect, as soon as they come to the House, you will send them to me; otherwise I must take my own course to find them."

The King then left the house; but evidently he was under the impression that he had made a moderate and sensible speech, for having seen John Rushworth,¹ one of the clerks of the House, copying it, he sent for him in the evening, and in spite of all protests demanded a copy, which he caused to be printed and circulated. As soon as he was gone out of the House the pent-up feelings of the members, which they had with difficulty repressed in the presence of the King, burst forth in loud cries of "Privilege, privilege!" which were echoed by the citizens along the street as the King and his

¹ *Rushworth Abridged*, vol. iv. p. 238.

retinue passed. The wilder spirits of this bodyguard of fiery loyalists were grievously disappointed: "with wicked oaths" they gave vent to their anger and they glared upon the restive citizens with hungry eyes. They had neither found the members nor had any opportunity been given to them for their favourite occupation of blood-letting. Some of them, when the King came to the door, exclaimed, "When comes the word?" Others when no word was given cried, "A lane, a lane!" and when they were asked what they would have done if they had had the King's command, they answered with much effrontery, "That, questionless, in the posture they were set, if the word had been given they should have fallen upon the House of Commons and have cut all their throats." Reluctantly they withdrew without having achieved anything but unpopularity for their master and dishonour for themselves.

Charles, for his part, must have been gravely dissatisfied with the result of his attempt; he had gained nothing save a more accurate knowledge of the temper of the House of Commons and of the citizens too. But he utterly failed to understand what he had done to provoke animosity so bitter. Thoughtfully and probably in sullen silence he returned to Whitehall, where he had one to face whom he dreaded as much as he loved. His Queen was waiting for him in the happy expectation that he would bring with him the objects of her wrath, that she might wreak her vengeance upon them. But, as he had been disappointed in the House of Commons, she was doomed to disappointment in the palace. She had been confident that her husband would return in triumphant fashion, but her own too ready tongue had utterly prevented any such triumph. Had she been able to keep a secret she might have gained her heart's desire perhaps; but her own folly would not prevent her from severely censuring the King for that very failure which she had been the chief means of bringing about. Well might Henrietta Maria be esteemed Charles's evil genius; as she herself said in later life, "'Twas I who sent him forth on that errand which sent him to his death, and he never reproached me." When a King so weak was governed by a woman so unwise, little else was to be expected than his own ruin and her misery.

In the meantime the Commons were left to themselves to meditate upon the action of the King: their feelings were equally divided between anger and fear; they felt that if kings were to be suffered to lead their myrmidons, not merely to coerce the freedom of debate, but to actively threaten the safety of life and limb, they might as well sit no longer. Next morning, which was the fifth of January, they met early and passed a Declaration affirming "that the King's coming to the House in a warlike manner to the terror and affrightment of the members is a high breach of the privileges

of Parliament and inconsistent with the liberty and freedom thereof.”¹ Coupled with the Declaration, of which the above is the substance, they sent a request to the Peers to join them in a petition for an adequate guard, that they might meet in safety. At the same² time they adjourned until the eleventh of January, having first appointed a committee of twenty-five to sit at the Guildhall. Amongst the committee-men was the noble-minded Lucius Cary, Earl of Falkland, whose only desire was to establish an ideal commonwealth with a constitutionally-limited King. There was the no less noble-minded Sir Ralph Hopton, whose regiment in the later wars was the only one amongst those on the side of the King which conducted itself with even an elementary regard to morality.³ With these were inferior men like the shifty traitor Sir John Hotham, Sir Benjamin Rudyard, that eloquent but unavailing Royalist, and Nathaniel Fiennes, the fiery son of Lord Say.

While the Commons were dispersed over the City of London, the King set out thither with a small retinue on the same day. As he passed along he was greeted with surly looks and cries of “Privileges of Parliament! Privileges of Parliament!”⁴ Much moved by the rebellious tone of his people, the King went on his way to the Common Council of the City of London. Having arrived at the Guildhall, he addressed the Lord Mayor and his fellow-councillors in defence of the proceedings of yesterday. He urged that “he had come to demand such as he had already accused of treason, who, he believed, were shrouded in the City, and he hoped would not be detained from him by any good man, seeing their offences were of a high nature. That, therefore, he desired their loving assistance for bringing them to a legal trial. And whereas suspicions were being raised of his being a favourer of Popery, he professed, on the word of a King, he ever did and would prosecute such as opposed the laws, whether Papists or Separatists, and would always maintain the true Protestant religion which his father professed.” Having thus cleared himself, as he vainly dreamed, in the eyes of the rulers of the City of London, he invited himself to dine with the Sheriffs, by whom he was royally entertained. As he was journeying to or from the City, one Walker, an ironmonger, threw into his⁵ carriage a scrap of paper with the ominous words, “To your tents, O Israel!” inscribed thereon: an allusion to the watchword of the rebellion of Jeroboam, not likely to be thrown away upon one who knew his Bible so well as Charles.

On January 8, as if he had not already done enough to alienate the hearts of the Londoners from him, Charles issued a proclamation

¹ Whitelock, *Memorials*, &c., p. 53; *Exact Collection*, pp. 38–41.

² Nelson, vol. ii. p. 824.

³ Winslanley's *Worthies*, pp. 546–7. Cf. Lloyd's *Memoires*, sub Hopton.

⁴ Rushworth *Abridged*, vol. iv. p. 239; *Great Rebellion*, vol. i. p. 285.

⁵ Heath's *Chronicle of the Civil War*, sub 1641–2, January 5.

for the¹ apprehension of Lord Kimbolton and the five members. But it was of no avail: the Committee, which had now removed to the Grocers' Hall,² and which was in full communication with the accused, simply passed a resolution declaring such a proclamation a breach of the privileges of Parliament. On the same day, during the examination of Samuel and Daniel Lewis before a justice of the peace, the following damaging evidence was given on oath against Captain David Hyde: "That being yesterday at dinner with the Lord Blaney, one Captain Hyde asked the said Daniel if he were a citizen; who, owning himself to be so, Hyde declared he was one of the first who drew sword upon the London apprentices, and heard there would come 10,000 citizens to guard the Parliament next Wednesday; but if they did it would be the bloodiest day seen in England these many years; adding he would kill as many of them as he could, being a company of prick-eared and crop-eared rascals, and he would believe a Papist before a Puritan. The deponent further attested that Hyde throughout his discourse used many horrid oaths, as God damme, &c."³ Even if the truculent captain's words were somewhat exaggerated by the terror or party feeling of the witnesses, this leaf out of the book of experience is sufficient to show that the Commons had some reason when they petitioned for a guard.

Next day Charles⁴ himself left London for Hampton Court to be out of the way of the threats of the mob, which was bitterly exasperated against him for his attempt upon the five members. It was a confession of failure, which must have been infinitely galling to a man of his temper; but probably the growing danger of his wife and children influenced him to take a course from which his proud spirit must have recoiled with loathing. It was not, however, until February 23 that the Queen left England, only for a brief year to see her husband's face again. Reluctantly, and inch by inch, the King gave way, and on January 11 London saw a glorious pageant. It was the day on which the Commons returned to Westminster bringing with them the five members. So irretrievably had the King alienated the sympathies of the City of London, that the Common Council resolved that eight companies of trained bands, with eight pieces of ordnance, accompanied by mounted

¹ *Rushworth Abridged*, vol. iv. p. 240.

² The Committee removed to the Grocers' Hall because the King was being entertained at the Guildhall. This we know from an *Order* (which has escaped Gardiner's notice) dated January 6, 1641-2, issued from the Guildhall, which is identical in terms with the one issued on January 3, to forbid the sealing of trunks or papers of the accused members or any other member of Parliament. This second Order has also escaped the notice of Thomas Husbonds, the printer of the *Exact Collection* (1642), unless he confounded it with the Order of three days previous. The second Order only differs from the first in that it concludes with these words: "*This was read three times at the Guildhall, in the presence of many thousand citizens, with great acclamation and joy. God save the King,*" an addition which conclusively proves that the Order is itself a second Order, and not merely misdated.

³ *Rushworth Abridged*, vol. iv. pp. 241-2.

⁴ *Id.* p. 241.

horsemen, should¹ form a guard for the two Houses from the Grocers' Hall to Westminster. From London Bridge to Westminster the river was guarded by lighters equipped with small ordnance, and manned by men under arms to the number of nearly 2000. The trained bands of Southwark also volunteered to guard the southern bank of the Thames, and the watermen tendered their barges to insure the members a safer journey to their Houses than could have been made by land. And so a sight was witnessed in London such as had seldom been seen before: there was a mighty procession both on land and by water. The attendants upon the returning members were armed and enthusiastic; the citizens of London felt that Lord Kimbolton and the five with their sturdy supporters had been engaged in a conflict in their interests, and they showed their gratitude by loud shouts of welcome. But when the barge was rowed along which bore Pym in triumph back to the House from which he had had to fly ignominiously only seven days ago the enthusiasm rose to its height. The people felt that here was their leader coming once more to take them to victory, their champion returning to wage successful war against harsh tyranny in the guise of Royal prerogative.

On their return to the House of Parliament the Commons were met by a message of more pacific tone from the King, who now at last saw that the nation was against him, though why that opposition should be he could not divine. He did not understand what wiser men than he had failed to perceive, that the old despotism was giving way to popular government—popular government, that is to say, of a rather crude and oligarchic character. On January 12 he finally waived all pretensions to arrest² his great political opponents. But in this, as in all his attempts at concession, he was as usual too late; indeed, the pitiful story of the reign of Charles I. might be summed up in the words "too late": too late to understand the temper of his people, too late in his efforts to turn his foes into his friends, too late to help his hapless relatives in the Palatinate, too late to serve the cause of the French Protestants; in short, he was too late for everything save the horrors of his execution.

And so the weak King had shot his wife's bullet, and had wounded nothing but the empty air and his own waning popularity. He had played for a great stake and had lost the game by his own folly and his Queen's rashness. So far from striking his enemies a deadly blow, as he had fondly hoped to do, he had prepared the ground for his scaffold and the awful tragedy of January 30. But if he had hastened forward the course of events with that awful Civil War, which destroyed so many of the great and noble of the

¹ *Great Rebellion*, vol. i. p. 298; Rushworth, iv. 242; Nalson, vol. ii. p. 831.

² Rushworth, vol. iv. p. 243; *Exact Collection*, pp. 49, 50.

land, he had laid the axe to the root of his own despotism, and rendered all future despotism impossible in England. And what shall be said of those six heroes who risked their lives in the sacred cause of liberty? Were they or were they not guilty of high treason according to the principles of government of their day? There can be no doubt that they were in every sense as guilty as the Earl of Strafford, who paid the penalty for his mistaken policy with his life. But their treason is their glory, for it was committed in the interests of liberty; whereas the treason of Charles's heroic servant was committed in the interests of a dying despotism and a King who was too weak to sway the "rod of empire." Though they scarce knew it themselves, they were treading the path of political progress and proving themselves to be heralds of a new era. Stern and grim they might be in their hard views of life, their creed might be an unbending and relentless Calvinism; but they stood firm for liberty, as they understood it, and risked their lives cheerfully in so holy a cause. And they triumphed as they deserved to triumph. What does it matter that differences divided those of them who survived to see the baleful course of the Civil War? Differences are incidental to human affairs. They stand out from the pages of history as men who would bow to no tyranny, but who were leaders in the vanguard of political freedom. They did commit treason; but their treason remains one of the landmarks in the path of progress, and we who owe so much to their noble fight may lay upon their graves the laurel-wreath of admiring recognition of the great victory they won so long ago.

ARTHUR W. FOX.

THE BOND OF EMPIRE.

THE desire for and the necessity of a bond of empire, so strong that the united enmity of the world shall not break it, though felt and seen before, is now seen and felt in a more vivid and real sense. At the present time that bond is composed of three strands only—strands too slight in a practical sense to stand the strain that the gradual development of colonial societies and the congestion of European affairs may put upon them. These strands are the sentiment of racial kinship, the direct and fully recognised over-lordship of the sovereign, the existence in England of a final Court of Appeal for the decision of all colonial legal questions. These three strands are of inestimable value as the core of an imperial and girdling cable. They represent national love, national business interests, national centralisation. But they may snap under the extraordinary pressure of extraordinary times. Such a contingency it is the nation's duty to forestall, to prevent. Such prevention lies in the present strengthening of the bond of empire, the present multiplication of the strands that form that bond. There are possibly many ways in which this can be done, but there is one way that seems to include or to involve by implication all the rest. Great Britain forms an indivisible country, in spite of the fact of its elaborate system of local government, because it has a central legislature in which the vast electorate has an actual and a personal interest—an interest that is quite independent of this or that form of local government. Similarly, it is suggested that if there were a Central Legislature of the Empire, then, whatever character might belong to the local legislative bodies in the colonies, however extensive and peculiar the powers of those bodies might be, yet the central legislature in which an imperial electorate had a direct personal interest would knit the mother-country and her dependencies together with an adamant and voluntary bond. But, it may be asked, is not an Imperial Assembly, a Diet drawn from every quarter of the globe, a mere dream of the constitutional or political theorist—a conception founded on no historic continuity, a fabric of the mind having no possible basis either in history or in nature? It must of course be admitted that paper constitutions as a rule, in practice, are imperfect and hateful in direct ratio to the loveliness and perfection of

their theory. The ideal Republics of South America, and certain ideal constitutions in Europe, such as that of Portugal, have taught the political student so much. A constitution is an organic being that grows in accordance with laws as yet imperfectly understood, and cannot be built to plan by any political architect, heaven-born or otherwise. For more than a century the world has been amusing itself with constitution-making, and the results, perhaps, have hardly justified the labour. That labour has, however, or, at any rate, ought to have taught politicians one fundamental fact: every change, each evolution or degree of evolution in a constitution must, if permanence is aimed at, be a legitimate organic development of the existing form. Dead branches may be cut away from a tree, but new branches cannot be stuck on, and the laws that govern effective grafting are as subtle as the laws of growth. Absolute forms may be removed from a constitution, reforms having kinship to a constitution may be grafted into it, but to it there cannot be added anything new and strange, unrelated and unfamiliar.

The test, then, to apply to a theoretic Imperial Assembly is whether it would or would not infringe the laws of organic constitutional development such as the history of institutions in this country exhibits. It is submitted that such an assembly would infringe those laws, and would, therefore, possess no elements of permanence, unless it came into existence in one of three ways. That is to say, unless it arose as the consequence of Colonial representation in the House of Commons, or Colonial representation in the House of Lords, or by the creation of an Imperial Committee of the existing Privy Council.

Mr. Chamberlain in his speech on June 24, 1897, to the assembled Premiers of the self-governing colonies said: "I feel that there is a real necessity for some better machinery of consultation between the self-governing colonies and the mother country, and it has sometimes struck me—I offer it now merely as a personal suggestion—that it might be feasible to create a great council of the Empire to which the colonies would send representative plenipotentiaries—not mere delegates who were unable to speak in their name, without further reference to their respective Governments, but persons who, by their position in the colonies, by their representative character, and by their close touch with colonial feeling, would be able, upon all subjects submitted to them, to give really effective and valuable advice. If such a council were to be created it would at once assume an immense importance, and it is perfectly evident that it might develop into something still greater. It might slowly grow to that Federal Council to which we must always look forward as our ultimate ideal." If Mr. Chamberlain in this passage means to suggest the creation of a new council disconnected from the Parliament, from the Privy Council, from the Crown, a body con-

stituted for purposes of advice, but possessing neither legislative nor financial powers, the creation of such a body would have little constitutional significance. It would mean simply that the Secretary of State for the Colonies would be supplied with information and assisted in deliberation by a representative colonial committee. Such an advising council seems beside the mark; useful no doubt it would be and convenient (or perhaps at times somewhat inconvenient) to the Colonial Secretary, but, constitutionally speaking, it would be on the whole meaningless and would possess little prospect of long life. Indeed, an Imperial Assembly or Council must mean much more than this, something very different from this. The Colonial Representative if he comes must come as one possessing authority and qualified to exercise power, and that can only be the case if he sits in some legislative or quasi-legislative body. Now, in its most slight or elementary form the beginnings of colonial representation on the Privy Council, or in either House of Parliament, would be constitutionally important, for in either case Orders in Council, or Parliamentary Acts, would be expressions of authority emanating from (*inter alios*) the colonial representatives. It will be necessary here to examine briefly the logical possibilities of such representation; but, before doing so, it is essential to realise that, however much constitutional development may be artificially fostered, slowness must be the real element in haste. The colonial mind must be appreciated, and must be educated on the subject of centralisation. The classes of questions that are and that will remain matters for Imperial discussion must be ascertained with the utmost clearness of definition. The difficult problem of colonial contributions to Imperial expenditure must be stated in some concrete form. The official report of the Conference of Premiers states that "there was a strong feeling among some of them that, with the rapid growth of population in the colonies, the present relations [with the mother country], could not continue indefinitely, and that some means would have to be devised for giving the colonies a voice in the control and direction of those questions of Imperial interest in which they are concerned equally with the mother country. It was recognised, at the same time, that such a share in the direction of Imperial policy would involve a proportionate contribution in aid of Imperial expenditure, for which, at present at any rate, the colonies generally are not prepared." The existing agreement with the Australasian colonies as to naval contributions, the likelihood of some not dissimilar arrangement being arrived at with the Cape, the offer of an annual contribution of 12,000 tons of coal by Natal, and the possibility of an agreement on the same subject being entered into with Canada, show that the not very remote future may see the problem of proportionate colonial contributions in a fair way of solution. It is clear, however, that the Imperial idea will not be grasped throughout

the Empire at once; that a more or less prolonged educational period must elapse before the Empire can become homogeneous in the sense that Great Britain is homogeneous within its own boundaries.

This result, indeed, can scarcely be attained while the word "colonist" remains to mark a distinction where there should exist no difference. Every man in the Empire must be, both in word and conception, an Imperialist, and the distinction between a colonist and a home-dweller must, if the consolidation of the Empire is ever to be complete, be no more than the distinction between a Kentish man and a man of Kent.

In fact, the constitutional movement of the next few years must be towards Imperial integration, Imperial citizenship, not only in legal fact but in mental outlook, so that a dweller in the remotest wild of the Queen's dominions must feel that it is as inconceivable for that wild to become differentiated from the Empire as it would be for the county of Rutland to stand out of the home scheme. To attain such a result many agencies must contribute. The Imperial idea must be taught in the schools; the pens of many ready and capable writers must show to all sorts and conditions of men the material advantages, the saving of waste, the avoidance of friction, that Imperial homogeneity presents; the voices of statesmen must declare the magnificence and the blessing that reside contiguously within the *Par Britannica*. Above all, there must be a beginning of constitutional centralisation, there must be a speedy seed-time, that the harvest may be reaped in due season.

Before passing to the three methods of colonial representation alluded to above it will be well to make some reference to the federal union of certain colonies or groups of colonies.

At the conference held at the Colonial Office the Premiers unanimously passed the following resolution: "They are also of opinion that it is desirable, whenever and wherever practicable, to group together under a federal union those colonies which are geographically united." The importance of this resolution, and the feeling that it represents, can scarcely be over-estimated. It must be remembered that Australia for fifty years has steadily moved towards internal federation. As early as 1849 a Federal Assembly had been mooted, while in 1857 the principle of federation was affirmed by the Association of Australian Colonies, sitting in London, and by the Parliaments of Victoria and South Australia. Though the Imperial Government would not identify itself with the principle, yet the movement continued, and in 1883 a convention was held which founded the Federal Council. This was confirmed by the Federal Council of Australasia Act, 1885 (48 & 49 Vict. c. 60), which offered an elaborate Federal constitution to the whole of Australasia. The first meeting of the Council took place at Hobart in 1885, but the fact that the Act was permissive rendered the meeting non-repre-

sentative, whilst the absence of executive powers hampered its action. In consequence of this, the movement altered its character. A convention, called by Sir Henry Parkes in 1890, led to the National Australian Convention, held at Sydney in 1891, when a Commonwealth Bill was produced, and a scheme independent of the Act of 1885 placed before the electorates. A Federal Enabling Bill, to sanction the calling of a Convention to frame a scheme of Federation, was accepted by all the colonies in 1895, save Queensland and New Zealand. The Convention sat in the spring of the year 1897, and considered the Bill of 1891. The result of the deliberations was practically accepted by all the convened colonies, except New South Wales. The difficulty thus created was to some extent met by the autumn sitting of the Convention, and, though Queensland did not take part, despite certain assurances that she would do so, in the sitting that opened in January 1898, yet that sitting has had a gratifying result. The Commonwealth Bill was accepted on March 16, 1898, by the delegates of all the other colonies, and has now been laid before the various electorates. This, we may hope, will finally and effectively bring about the Federation of the various colonies on the Australian continent. Whilst in Australia we see that the struggle for federation is still in progress, we find, on turning to North America, that the contest has been over for thirty years. In 1867 the British North America Act (30 & 31 Vict. c. 3) constituted the Dominion of Canada, and created a Federal Union governed by a written constitution, the terms of which, when doubt arises, are interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada, with an appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Dominion Central Government and the eight provincial or local Governments are the creatures of the constitution, and cannot vary it in its general form, though the local legislatures can, within limits, modify the local constitutions.

The time does not yet appear to be ripe for the federation of South Africa, but there can be little doubt that the fact of an actual working federation in Australia will hasten the movement towards that united South Africa which has so fascinated many minds. For the present, at least, New Zealand and Newfoundland will stand aside from schemes of geographic federation.

I now pass to the question of colonial representation in the House of Commons. It is well known that Sir Wilfrid Laurier does not despair of such a consummation, and sees no *à priori* impossibility in such a method of imperial centralisation. The idea, however, is not one that is likely to recommend itself to those who are familiar with the modern development of the House of Commons as a debating and voting assembly. An increase in the membership of the House of Commons is not devoutly to be wished. The principle of delegation of important work to imperfectly reported committees would be

extended, and to that extent the electorate would lose touch with its representatives. Moreover, an awkward alternative would present itself: there would have to be either a complete reconstruction of parties, or else the colonial delegates would throw themselves into one or other of the existing parties, and identify themselves with aspects of home politics entirely unrelated to the purpose for which they sit. Either horn of the dilemma is uncomfortable. The identification of colonial representatives with home parties would speedily set the tide of English opinion against imperial centralisation; while, on the other hand, the creation of two Imperial parties, dealing with the whole interests of the Empire in accordance with the principles of party politics, would not only accentuate those weaknesses that are inherent in federalism when it is adopted on a vast scale, but it would throw the home interests of the British Isles into the background to an extent that would be insufferable. The difficulties that arise when an elective chamber, representing the whole of the self-governing portion of the British dominions, is seriously considered seem, indeed, almost insuperable. The machine would be too complicated, even if it were possible to construct it. One may, indeed, be allowed to doubt whether any one is capable of working out the intricate problems of representation that are involved in such matter.

The same difficulties do not occur necessarily in the case of colonial representation in the House of Lords, or on an Imperial Committee of the Privy Council, or, at any rate, if they do occur, their form is simplified to the proportions of practical solution.

In the case of the House of Lords it will be sufficient for the purposes of this article to consider only the question of the representation of the self-governing colonies. It is, of course, unnecessary to consider the Empire of India; colonies governed directly by the Crown possess no vehicle for popular representation, whilst colonies with a strictly Crown executive and an elective legislature are not yet sufficiently developed to claim Imperial representation. We are, therefore, left with only the eleven self-governing colonies. It will not be, perhaps, too great a demand on the imagination to assume, for the purposes of representation, a federalised South Africa and a federalised Australia. Thus we should have to consider the representation of New Zealand, Newfoundland, South Africa, the Dominion of Canada, and Australia, or, in other words, five colonial groups.

It is now necessary to consider the problem of representation—to devise some method by which the colonial electorates shall be represented. I may say in passing that the method of representation here proposed applies *pari passu* to representation on the Imperial Committee of the Privy Council, concerning which I have made some comment below. Now, first of all, two things are clear. The representatives must be popularly elected in the colonies, but they

cannot be elected into the House of Lords. How then could they, under the existing *régime*, be admitted into the Upper House? This House is popularly described as an hereditary chamber, but, nevertheless, that description is by no means accurate. In the earlier stages of our constitution life peers undoubtedly sat in the House of Lords, and in 1876 by the Appellate Jurisdiction Act (39 & 40 Vict. c. 59) Lords of Appeal were created, and by section 6 it was provided that "every lord of appeal in ordinary, unless he is otherwise entitled to sit as a member of the House of Lords, shall by virtue and according to the date of his appointment be entitled during his life to rank as a baron by such style as her Majesty may be pleased to appoint, and [shall during the time that he continues in his office as a lord of appeal in ordinary, *and no longer*] be entitled to a writ of summons to attend, and to sit and vote in the House of Lords; his dignity as a lord of parliament shall not descend to his heirs." The words in brackets were repealed by the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1887, but the fact that they have formed for a considerable period a part of the statute book is sufficient for my purpose. It is clearly not contrary to the practice of the law for a man to be a Lord of Parliament not only for life, but even for an indefinite term of years. Indeed, this is clearly so from other cases. Bishops sit by custom and by statute as the holders of certain ecclesiastical offices; where a vacancy occurs "such vacancy shall be supplied by the issue of a writ of summons to the bishop *elected* to the same see" (Erskine May). The Act of 1847 (10 & 11 Vict. c. 108) which regulates the manner in which bishops shall sit, thus fully recognises the practice and custom of Lords of Parliament being elected for an indefinite term of years. Again, by the Act of Union with Scotland (1707), Scotch peers sit in the House of Lords by election from their own body, and they are elected not for life but for the term of the existing parliament only. On the other hand, by the Act of Union with Ireland (1801), Irish peers elect for life representatives out of their body to sit in the House of Lords. Of course Scotch and Irish representative peers are peers of the realm as well as Lords of Parliament, but they certainly supply strength to my contention that, so far as representation in the Upper House is considered, the fact of election and the fact of uncertainty as to the period of tenure are not, either in point of history or of practice, impediments to Lordship in Parliament. The method of colonial representation is therefore clear. Let the Crown create in each colony certain offices the holders of which for the time being shall be entitled to a writ of summons, and (varying the words of the Act of 1847 in the case of bishops) on a vacancy such vacancy shall be supplied by the issue of a writ of summons *to the person elected to the vacated office*.

The necessary election would take place by means of direct or

indirect popular suffrage: that is to say, the holder of an office must hold it by the sanction of the Colonial electorate. How would this be possible? We must consider the five colonial groups that I have dealt with previously. The Federal Council of Australia will be an elective body of, we must suppose, considerable dimensions. Six members of it (one from each of the federated colonies) might be directly elected to offices in the council which carry with them the right to writs of summons. Representation in this way would put the Federal Council, and therefore all Australia, in the most intimate touch with the Imperial authority. Next consider New Zealand. The government of this colony is carried on by a Crown Governor, a senate or legislative council nominated by the Governor, and a popular legislative assembly elected on a low franchise. It is suggested that there should be created a post on the legislative council, the holder of which for the time being should be nominated by the executive council of the Governor and elected by the legislative assembly. The case of Newfoundland is identical with that of New Zealand. If federation in South Africa takes the same form as that suggested for Australia, the form of election of two representatives (say) would be identical. If not, it may be that Natal, which is governed on the same lines as New Zealand, would elect its representative in the same way, and that the Cape of Good Hope (where both senate and legislative assembly are elected) would direct its Governor to elect to the representative office some person jointly nominated by the two Houses. I have left the difficult case of the Dominion of Canada to the last. In the Dominion there are the Federal Government and eight local governments, namely, Prince Edward's Isle, Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba, Ontario, British Columbia, and the North-west Territories. The first of these has two legislative elective assemblies; the second and third have elective legislative assemblies and upper legislative chambers appointed by the Lieutenant-Governors; the remaining five provinces have single legislative assemblies. Each province has a Lieutenant-Governor appointed by the Governor-General. The complexity of these varying secondary constitutions renders it somewhat difficult to arrive at a satisfactory method of representation, and this difficulty is not lessened by the fact that the Dominion Parliament, with its nominated senate and elective legislative assembly, must have a predominant voice in the election. A fairly simple, but at the same time not an entirely satisfactory solution, would be for each of the eight local legislatures to nominate a representative, and for these nominations to be confirmed or rejected by the Dominion Executive Council. In the case of confirmation the Governor could then elect the nominees to the representative offices. If these numbers were followed, the Colonies would be represented in the House of Lords by eighteen Lords of Parliament—a number too restricted to be used effectively for mere

home political combinations, but sufficient to reflect in this country the tendency of colonial opinions, and to initiate or support those lines of imperial policy with which their own local government for the time being is identified. There can be little doubt that if these colonial Lords of Parliament were invariably men of high capacity and political purity, they would mould and shape the whole colonial policy of the Empire.

Before passing from the subject of colonial representation in the House of Lords, it will render the possible aspect complete if the question of representation of the Colonial Church is mentioned, though of course to do so may arouse the bitter animosity of sect-bound Nonconformity.

"To the estate of lords spiritual were added four bishops on the part of Ireland, on the union of that country with Great Britain, who sat by rotation of sessions, and represented the whole episcopal body of Ireland in Parliament. But on the disestablishment of the Irish Church in 1869, the bishops of that Church were deprived of their seats in Parliament after January 1, 1871" (Erskine May). This, at any rate, is a precedent for the representation of the Colonial Church in Parliament—a representation which would, apart from all question of denominationalism, undoubtedly add another bond of union to the Empire, and would create uniformity of purpose in the social efforts of the clergy. If a metropolitan from each of the five groups of colonies mentioned and a metropolitan from India were accorded seats in the House of Lords, the number of ecclesiastics in the Upper House would only exceed by two the number there before 1871, and the Church throughout the British dominions would be represented. Probably even those who would oppose most bitterly the extension of Church representation in the Imperial Legislature will admit that there is something fascinating, something that makes for enthusiasm, in the idea of an Imperial temporal authority and an Imperial spiritual authority exercising sway over the interacting moral, social, and political events of the greatest of modern or ancient empires. If the idea were ever realised it would almost fulfil Dante's conception of world-wide temporal and spiritual powers exercising their correlative functions side by side.

I pass now to the third organic method of colonial representation—the creation of an Imperial Committee of the Privy Council. The influence that the Privy Council and its committees have had upon the history of this country is, perhaps, insufficiently appreciated by the students of constitutional movements. The Council is a body at least as ancient as Parliament, and during six centuries it has played a vastly important, though an unobtrusive, part upon the stage of great affairs. Early in the thirteenth century we find in existence a body called the Continual Council, which exercised the twofold function of personally advising the king and of administering certain

State business matters. Its orders issued *per regem et secretum consilium*, and its powers were co-extensive with the royal prerogative. At the end of the fourteenth century it constituted the English executive, and during the reign of Henry VI. the title of Privy Council was assumed. During the reign of Henry VIII. the Council was a small and sufficiently servile body, but in the succeeding reign the number of members increased to forty, and the Council was formally divided into executive committees—a fact of far-reaching importance. In 1553 a Committee of State was created and entrusted with great power, and we find that in 1640 a committee of the same name was endeavouring to exercise that power. This committee was spoken of as a Cabinet—that is, a wrongly secret—Council. On the accession to power of Charles II., Lord Clarendon advised the continuation of the system of committees for the performance of departmental work, whilst matters of supreme national importance were assigned to a body called the Foreign Committee. A curious change suddenly arose. Charles II. placed himself in the hands of a small nameless committee of the Council, and, though this fact gave rise to certain constitutional difficulties, yet we find, early in the eighteenth century, that this little committee has suddenly and for ever displaced the Privy Council as the consulting body of the Crown, and has become neither more nor less than the Cabinet—in touch with Parliament and the Crown—as we understand it. What was the fate of the Privy Council? We have seen that, while it lost its consultative function, it developed very fully its departmental or administrative function. This fact is supremely important. Consider first the judicial powers of the Council. Soon after its creation it assumed, as the representative of the King, the right of supplementing the obviously imperfect justice of the form-bound Common Law Courts. This, we may remember, was also done by the King's Chancellor—that ghostly keeper of the royal conscience. But the Chancery Court restricted itself to a particular class of redress, and left in the hands of the Privy Council considerable judicial ability, relating for the most part to the maintenance of order and the assistance of those on whom poverty or oppression shut the doors of the King's Courts. This civil jurisdiction (which developed into the Court of Requests) and the criminal jurisdiction lasted to the very end of the sixteenth century.

But this jurisdiction must not be confused with that of the Star Chamber, though the two judicial bodies had many things in common. In 1640 the Long Parliament abolished the Star Chamber, and took away from the Privy Council the remnants of its judicial capacity, and ended, as it thought for ever, its legal functions. But this was not so. The Act forbade the Council to deal with matters cognisable in the Common Law Courts, but it could not take away from English suitors, denizens of English dependencies but unpro

vided with English justice, the right of appealing to the Crown for that justice. From early times such appeals had been brought, and in the reign of Henry VIII. appeals from Jersey were granted. In 1661, on the Restoration, a standing committee of the Council was appointed to hear Channel Islands appeals, and in 1667 these appeals and appeals from the plantations were handed over to the Committee for Trades and Plantations. In 1696 it was ordered that a committee of all the Lords, or any three, were to hear appeals. In 1716 an appeal from the Isle of Man against a decree of Lord Derby was heard by the committee. In addition to this wide appellate jurisdiction, the Privy Council exercised the right to settle all questions as to lunatics or their property, and later all admiralty and ecclesiastical appeals. In 1833 the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was formed by statute, and endowed with an extensive and peculiar jurisdiction.

I do not know any more instructive lesson in organic constitutional development in the face of all difficulties than that of the judicial authority of the Privy Council. The growth of other committees is a further valuable comment on the expansive power of the Council.

Thus from 1660 till the creation of the Board of Trade in 1862, the wide duties of that board were carried out by a committee.

The Local Government Board was created in 1871, and was then invested with the important duties concerning public health previously performed by the Privy Council.

The Board of Agriculture, created in 1889, was invested with vast powers that until then had been exercised by the Privy Council. On the other hand, the public education of this country has been since 1839, and still is, in the hands of a committee of the Privy Council. It must be noted here that a Committee for Foreign Plantations was created in 1660, and it was a subsequent, and still technically existing, combination of this committee with the Committee on Trade that during the present century advised the Colonial Office as to the character of colonial constitutions to be granted in Australia and Africa. This leads to the consideration of what may be called the legislative ability that resides in the Privy Council. For certain colonies the Crown has power to legislate by Order in Council; in other colonies the Crown has delegated the law-making power to officials. In a large number of colonies the Constitution has been imposed by Order in Council, and Orders in Council can veto all colonial Acts. The South African empire is technically the creation of Orders in Council, among which may be noted the Order of 1891, which brought the huge South African sphere of influence under the rule of the High Commissioner, and the Matabeleland Order of 1894.

The Queen, by means of the Order in Council, exercises a far-

reaching rule. In this way legislatures and laws have been distributed with Napoleonic lavishness, and colossal territories have been added to the Empire and endowed with the Imperial laws. From all this Parliament stands apart. There exists, of course, in the Legislature an overriding power, but that power is almost necessarily quiescent since the machinery of the Privy Council is set to work by the Cabinet without any necessary reference to Parliament. The intimate touch of the Privy Council with the colonies, and the extensive executive and legislative powers of which it is the channel, seem to justify the suggestion that it should include elected colonial representatives. If an Imperial Committee were created, which should consist of the Cabinet and the eighteen colonial representatives described in that portion of this paper that deals with representation in the House of Lords, and in addition some nominated representatives of the Crown colonies and the colonies with semi-responsible government, a body with unequalled ability for dealing with Imperial problems would exist. This committee, since it would include the Cabinet, would possess as a matter of course all those executive legislative and vetoing powers that can be exercised by means of Orders in Council, and thus it would almost seem as if the most powerful bond of Empire that could be forged would be the creation of such a committee.

The various aspects of representation put forward in this article are, of course, but weak attempts in the semi-darkness to realise a constitutional something which in the fuller light of later days may prove to be a thing quite other than is here conceived. Clearly at the present time it would be preposterous to pledge one's intelligence to any particular form of representation. Thought on the subject, however, of some kind or another is not to be deprecated. Englishmen cannot doubt that in a future not very far removed some form of colonial representation will come, and that that form will be a legitimate development of existing institutions is an assumption sanctioned by the operations of history. The writer, however, has avoided, or at any rate has intended to avoid, in the various steps of his argument anything approaching dogmatism.

J. E. G. DE MONTMORENCY.

PRACTICAL RELIGION :

FROM THE AGNOSTIC'S POINT OF VIEW.

CONSIDERING the number of books that have been written upon what constitutes religion, it may seem a little late in the day to discuss the subject; but while there are innumerable churches, with large congregations, it is not easy to find many men or women who make any serious effort to apply the teaching of Christ to every-day life. If any proof of the accuracy of this assertion is desired, a glance at the vast amount of political and municipal corruption—which is the direct outcome of want of integrity in business affairs—will surely supply it. I refer, of course, to the country in which I am writing—the United States—and not to Great Britain.

True religion consists in reverence for and strict adherence to an ethical standard in every daily act; and whether compliance with this definition is accompanied by a belief in some dogma or not is a matter of little importance, if it is understood that there can be no true religion without integrity in the ordinary affairs of life. Attendance at church cannot, and does not, furnish any guarantee of integrity.

The late John Tyndall, and our great master, more recently deceased, Thomas Huxley, although firm opponents of every kind of dogma, were truly religious men, their religion consisting of a recognition of their duties to their fellow-men, coupled with absolute uprightness. It is not denied, of course, that Huxley's code of ethics is adhered to by some orthodox persons who still accept the words of the Bible in their literal meaning; but it is nevertheless a fact that the average church-going Christian does not attempt to live up to his theoretical moral code. Is it not notorious that perjury in the law courts, and lying by persons who are generally regarded as reputable, is more prevalent to-day than anybody cares to admit—perhaps more common than similar breaches of morality ever were before? The time for plain speaking has arrived, and the great Reviews will be lacking in their duty if they fail to make their voice heard with no uncertain sound. Let there be no mistake concerning truth and truthfulness, for truth is the foundation of all honour and of everything that honourable men or women consider sacred; it is the corner-stone of all true religion, so much so that no

amount of repetition of dogma, or of the singing of hymns, can compensate for the disregard of it.

It is difficult to imagine anything, except deliberate untruth, that is more immoral than a professed belief in matters which are supported by no scientific evidence whatsoever, and which, being contrary to human experience, would not be accepted as true, even if testified to by a number of credible witnesses. The story of Genesis has been proved by science to be positively untrue; and anybody who still persists in regarding it as a verity is either very ignorant or very dishonest. The persons who argue that the "creation" of the world took place in so many "geological periods"—an expression which they substitute for the word "days"—would do well to note that "the text says that each day was made up of a morning and an evening, while the Decalogue fixes the sense by enjoining the observance of the seventh day as that on which the Creator rested after the six days' labour of creation."¹ Upon this point, however, the Episcopal Church has already begun to recognise the truth, as is recognised by Canon Bonney's address at a Church Congress held at Norwich, England, two years ago :

"I cannot deny," said this outspoken clergyman, "that the increase of scientific knowledge has deprived parts of the earlier books of the Bible of the historical value which was generally attributed to them by our forefathers. The story of the Creation in Genesis, *unless we play fast and loose either with words or with science,*" cannot be brought into harmony with what we have learned from geology. The ethnological statements are imperfect, if not sometimes inaccurate. The stories of the Flood and of the Tower of Babel are incredible in their present form. Some historical element may underlie many of the traditions in the first eleven chapters of that book, but this we cannot hope to recover."

The Presbyterians, and the Methodists also, seem to be anxious to recognise the truth. These are the words of Principal Grant, of Kingston (Canada), a Presbyterian :

"All colleges now profess to study the Bible scientifically, and the Churches must, therefore, accept conclusions arrived at in accordance with canons of universal validity, or perish morally in the presence of the scientifically educated world. Science is marching on irresistibly because there is no sectarianism in science. There can be none, because reason is one."

Dr. Burtwash, President of Victoria College (Canada), is a Methodist. What are his views on scientific truth ?

"For my own part," says this enlightened cleric, "I have long since ceased to lecture on polemical theology, and have adopted the historical methods of comparative theology, striving from the centre of union of all the doctrines to work out a more perfect grasp of truth than could ever be possible from

¹ Excerpt from Mr. Goldwin-Smith's article in the *North American Review* for December 1895.

² The italics are mine.

within the Chinese wall of our own 'ism.' There are men who think that in religion the scientific spirit has no place, and that the dogmatic must reign supreme. . . . What is the scientific spirit? It is the simple, honest desire to get at the truth. It is the candid willingness to accept the truth wherever we find it, *and no matter how it may cross our preconceived opinion.*¹ Has it come to this, that our creeds are more precious than the truth, that we must shut our eyes lest the blazing light of the nineteenth century should reveal some imperfection in the form, or even in the matter, of our historical creeds?"

There are, of course, innumerable statements in the Old Testament as well as in the New which cannot be denounced as untrue, but which are, nevertheless, extremely improbable and incapable of credence upon the existing evidence. In this class must be placed the story of the birth of Christ and of His death and resurrection. While assertions of this character may be well founded, it is most likely that they are not; and all honourable and thinking men ought to learn to keep their opinion in suspense, not only upon biblical matters, but in every case in which there is no scientific evidence to enable a trained intellect to arrive at any definite conclusion.

The utmost claim of scientific scepticism is the right to examine the evidence of a revelation professing to be divine in the same searching way as it would examine any other evidence—to endeavour to trace its origin and development, and to weigh the value of religious conceptions as of other conceptions. It violates the fundamental habit of the scientific mind, the very principle of its nature, to demand of it the unquestioning acceptance of any form of faith that tradition may hand down as divinely revealed. When the followers of a religion appeal, as the followers of every religion do, in proof of it to the testimony of miraculous events contrary to our experience of the present order of nature, there is present a scientific fact, *not contrary to human experience of the order of nature*, which they overlook, but which it is incumbent to bear in mind—viz., that eager and enthusiastic disciples sometimes have visions and often dream dreams, and that they are apt unconsciously to imagine, or purposely to invent, extraordinary or supernatural events, by which the imagined importance of the subject is largely augmented, and by which the burning zeal of their faith is strengthened.

The calm observer and sincere interpreter of nature cannot set capricious or arbitrary bounds to his inquiries at any point where another may assert that he ought to do so; he cannot choose, but must claim and maintain the right to search and try what any man, Jew or Gentile, Mussulman or Brahman, has declared sacred, and see if it is true. And if it does not appear true to his mind, what matters it to him how true it may seem to others? The theologian tells him that the limits of philosophical inquiry are where faith begins; that faith is a virtue, and that to question the verity of

¹ The italics are mine.

what appears in the Bible is sacrilege. The scientific investigator, upon the other hand, believes that philosophical inquiry has no limits; that blind faith in what is unsupported by any tangible evidence is an unpardonable breach of integrity, and that it is his duty to examine the data upon which all so-called "faith" is founded. And if this right of free inquiry is denied to him, then is denied to him also the right to doubt what any fanatic or impostor may choose to proclaim as a revelation from the spiritual world.

It is impossible to exaggerate the sinister influence which orthodox faith exercises over the minds of persons, especially women, of limited education. They appear to be able, by reason of their religious "faith," to convince themselves that anything is true, if their purpose is served by regarding it in that light. Indeed, their test of their own veracity, if they exercise any at all, is merely the query, "Is it desirable to assume the accuracy of this?"

The argument is often heard that it is justifiable to tell untruths in order to save pain or annoyance. This argument usually comes from persons of little mental capacity and of equally little education, some of whom go to church with great regularity, and many of whom doubtless consider themselves quite sure of a place in heaven. The refutation of this gross breach of morality is, first, that nobody can determine whether his or her untruths will save unpleasantness or not, the probability being that when the truth is eventually learned—as it usually is, sooner or later—increased annoyance will be felt in addition to resentment against the individual who practised the deception. But a far more important objection to this form of ostensibly altruistic untruth is that, if the habit of telling untruths, or prevaricating about trifles, is indulged in even occasionally, like any other bad habit it becomes chronic, and all respect for truth vanishes, lying being resorted to whenever anything—it matters not how small the consideration may be—can be gained by it. In other words, persons who acquire the habit of untruthfulness, after the lapse of a short time, do not know when they are lying and when they are not; they themselves have become so accustomed to the perversion of the truth that they cannot realise when they are relating what has actually occurred and when their assertions are mere hallucinations.

There is no dispute between science and religious orthodoxy as to the theoretical importance of veracity. But in actual practice the majority of orthodox persons may well take a lesson from agnosticism in adherence to truth, which is, of course, the basis of any scientific creed. The old idea, which amounted to little more than "If you do not please the deity by doing what is right, you will surely go to hell," has, unfortunately, been abandoned before any substitute has been successfully impressed upon the popular mind, and, as a consequence, every-day morality is in a condition of chaos. A doctrine

of a different character is now required, and the sooner it is expounded and understood the better it will be for the civilised world. Looking at the theoretical code which is inculcated as the essential rule of Christian practice, some attempt ought to be made to weigh the actual effect on character of the solemn profession of principles and precepts which appear to be too exacted to be reconcilable with the exigencies of practical life. The Christian religion is one of passivity rather than of activity; it teaches mankind how to suffer better than how to accomplish any practical end; and if its principles were faithfully carried out in detail they could not fail eventually to leave the Christian at the mercy of the rogue. Christianity, as it is called, but which is really Paulinism, is a gospel which could be preached with more consistency and with some sense of sincerity when the world was thought to be near its end, when nothing better could be done than to prepare for that end, rather than to a world which has gone on, and continues to go on, as if it were never coming to an end. In commerce, in political life, in all the departments of practical activity, a man must, if he wishes to succeed, have another creed and another practice. Upon the one hand he fulfils, as essential to his present well-being, the law of natural selection, by which the strong takes advantage of his strength, and the weak is made to pay the penalty of his weakness; upon the other hand he professes, as essential to his eternal well-being, the altruistic doctrine that he should not lay up for himself treasure on earth, that he should prefer his brother in all things to himself, and that, when he is smitten on one cheek, he should meekly turn the other also to the smiter. To profess belief in this creed, but to adopt the practice which the cosmic process forces upon us, is, of course, the height of hypocrisy; and any man who is successful in business or professional life, but who pretends to strictly adhere to the dogmas of Paulinism—which he calls Christianity—is unquestionably an arrant hypocrite.

It is most injurious to the strength of intellectual and moral character that there should be a fundamental contradiction between theory and practice whereby life is made a shifting compromise, or a systematic inconsistency, or—as is the case most frequently—an organised and ingeniously constructed sham; and one cannot help thinking that it would be well that, in place of a rule of life consisting of natural selection very irregularly and very occasionally tempered by Christianity, there should be established an attempt at harmony between the nominal ethical code and the practice of everyday existence. If existing doctrines will not grow to new requirements they must be changed, for no doctrine can claim to limit rigidly the belief of mankind for all time; and any attempt to bind the views of thinking men by means of any dogma must put a stop to mental development.

What must be our guiding star for the immediate future? Before attempting to put any maxim into words, a quotation from a distinguished (and ultra-orthodox) English lawyer, not long deceased, may not seem out of place: "I would rather," said Lord Selborne, "that my children were educated after the manner of the ancient Persians, to ride, to shoot, to speak the truth, than that they should be taught all the knowledge in the world without the inculcation of the moral principle which is involved in speaking the truth." This expression leads us to Huxley's well-known and clearly-expressed views upon the duty of man—viz., that absolute integrity of thought and of action in things of trifling moment, as well as in matters of serious importance—be the consequences what they may—is the only process by which the suffering of humanity can be alleviated.

Since the above was written, my attention has been drawn to an address given by the English Bishop of Ripon (Dr. Boyd Carpenter) at a meeting of the subscribers to the Huxley Memorial Fund. The *Nation* of June 4 (1896) quotes the following words of Dr. Carpenter: "Religious truth, in one sense, must always wait on scientific truth, and religious truth must often change its form at the bidding and on the information of scientific truth."

To any one who can remember how incessantly the clerics of almost all denominations attacked the late Mr. Darwin, the above words will cause some amusement. But the subject has a serious aspect. What, I ask, does the average minister know of scientific facts? Is, as a rule, even his general education satisfactory? These questions can be best answered by an excerpt, not from an agnostic publication, but from the New York *Christian Advocate*, copied into the Buffalo, New York, *Commercial* of July 20, 1895: "Why not make the degree of Doctor of Divinity one to be taken on examination? It means nothing now unless the person receiving it attaches the name of the institution that gave it to him, and not always then. It has become a burlesque of common sense. The ignorant, not only of theology and Church history, but of the English language, sport it."

A few words upon another subject. The habit of swearing is, to all refined persons, most objectionable. I regret to say, however, that many men who profess Christian principles, and who attend church more or less regularly—persons who are considered eminently respectable—often make use of expressions of a most offensive nature. If the accuracy of my assertion is doubted, I beg the doubter to sit for half an hour in the office of any hotel in any town or city in the United States, and judge for himself. But I have not yet mentioned what I regard as the most serious aspect of the case. Hardly a day passes without my hearing profane and obscene expressions used by boys. Sometimes I hear this disgusting language as I walk along the street, while at others it reaches me as I

sit at my window. Nor is this all. As I see the children who employ these disgusting expressions, there is no possible doubt in my mind as to the accuracy of what I am writing. I have used the word "children"—yes, some children, not over fourteen years of age, the sons of highly reputable parents, are quite accustomed to call each other names that cannot be repeated here. These boys apparently think it manly, perhaps noble, to imitate their elders in the utterly shameful habit of swearing. I do not think that ministers of the gospel seem to be making any serious effort to suppress this practice; indeed, as far as I can judge, it is very seldom denounced from the pulpit, and yet its prevalence must be well known to the pastor of every church in the country. Are these gentlemen so occupied with their attempts to establish the verity of some archaic dogma, which science has disproved, that they have no time to devote to any practical form of religion? But I want to draw the reader's notice to another point which is, I am sure, either ignored or understated.

Good conduct, like every other mental habit, must have an organic basis—a mechanism of nerve-cells. As altruism can be given effect to in every part of conduct, the mechanism representing it is, unquestionably, intricate and delicate. Higher morality, in addition, is a late acquisition, and its mechanism is consequently unstable and very easily impaired. It is for this reason that moral lapses commonly occur in the early stages of brain disorder, and frequently indicate a pathological variation of brain function. This condition is so eloquently expressed by Dr. Maudsley that I am in duty bound to conclude this paper by quoting his words:

"Good moral feeling is to be looked upon as an essential part of a sound and rightly developed character in the present state of human evolution in civilised lands. Its acquisition is the condition of development in the process of humanisation. Whoever is destitute of it is to that extent a defective being; he marks the beginning of race degeneracy; and if propitious influences do not chance to check or to neutralise the morbid tendency, his children will be actual morbid varieties. Whether the particular outcome of the morbid strain shall be vice, or madness, or crime, will depend much on the circumstances of life; but there is no doubt in my mind that one way in which insanity is generated *de novo* is through the deterioration of nature which is shown in the absence of moral sense. . . ."

Now, I insist, with full knowledge of what I am writing, that the habit of swearing shows a defective moral sense, because it deteriorates the individual's higher nature. I say that it is a disgraceful habit, which is never found among true agnostics; and I further affirm that, as far as I can learn, orthodox religion is doing practically nothing to check its increase among so-called Christians.

LAWRENCE IRWELL.

: MEN'S WOMEN IN FICTION.

THIS title has a misleading sound : it seems to suggest a survey of the fascinators of the Cleopatra type who have exercised an influence, sometimes good, but more often bad, and always inexplicable to the female mind, over the so-called stronger sex ; whereas the subject of this paper would be more accurately indicated by some such cumbersome heading as " Women as depicted by Men in Fiction."

After a long career of novel reading, one is almost tempted to exclaim with an ancient writer : " One man among a thousand have I found, but a woman among all these have I not found." They are saints, or Jezebels, or monuments of obstinacy or colourlessness, or a hundred other things ; but they are hardly ever *women*.

Perhaps nothing in the world is harder than to write a book, especially a novel ; if you think of it, it requires an almost superhuman attitude on the part of the writer. It must be hard enough when you know all about your subject, but when you know scarcely anything about it, which we may take to be the state of mind of most men with regard to women, it must require the courage of a Hercules, with, perhaps, something of his brute insensibility to what he was undertaking. For it may be asserted, without compromise, that men are bad judges of women's characters : they underrate them, or they overrate them, but they hardly ever judge them accurately. There are several causes which conduce to this inaccuracy, apart from the central fact that men are inherently bad judges.

One of these causes is that most men take their women ready-made, so to speak. Mankind has always found it easy to be witty at the expense of womankind, and we all know that nothing is easier than to make things fit in with a preconceived idea. If any one doubts this, he should read Mark Twain's account of the poor old woman who turned out to be the queen ; it would be difficult to find a more natural example. Some one once asserted that women were curious : we work back from this profound axiom, and find that Eve ate the apple from curiosity—Adam's lofty motives have been explained by Milton. Lot's wife looked round from curiosity ; of course, having been a resident in the city, she could have no real interest in its fate. A few more examples of this kind have been collected, and the fact is proved beyond contestation.

The same amazing penetration has regarded a virtue known as patience as a special attribute of women, and we find beautiful heroines called Griselda, or Amelia, or Sophia, held up to admiration on, apparently, no other ground than that they deliberately train men to be selfish, sensual, faithless, insolent bullies. Consequently a man who is making observations about women cannot start fair, but must assume that she possesses, by virtue of her sex, the stock virtues: capacity for sympathy in suffering of a legitimate kind, affectionateness, love of children, of needlework, and good works, and unselfishness; and the stock vices too: these are easier to enumerate, having been carefully catalogued by the wisdom of ages in a thousand epigrams, plays, novels, and poems. They are, briefly, obstinacy, deceitfulness, unreasonableness, jealousy, spitefulness, curiosity, and an incapacity for holding the tongue. These, O women, are your inevitable burden; without these a man is unable to tabulate you.

Another cause is, doubtless, the habit of want of candour which long ages of tyranny have succeeded in stamping on the mind of woman: they are too apt to take the conventional valuation of themselves as the essential one, as a thing to be lived up to, and to assume a virtue—or a vice—if they have it not. Too many women, even honest ones, seem to try to be different when they are with men, and in particular one cannot help noticing, even among educated women, a tendency to that foolish kind of flattery which consists in professing a degree of ignorance which does not exist, in order that the man may smile indulgently and feel his own superiority. Aggressive displays of knowledge are not to be admired, but this want of candour is a thing to be strongly protested against. You say, "Men like it": what if they do? let them go to some one who is really as ignorant as you profess to be, and be happy with her. Besides, that is largely a popular fallacy, mere convention; we take exaggerated expression of momentary feeling for literal utterance of permanent opinion, much as when people tell you, if you are unmusical, that Shakespeare says "The man that hath no music in his soul. . . . is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils," but Shakespeare does not say so: he makes little twopenny-halfpenny emotional Lorenzo say it—and a very suitable sentiment it is for him—but Shakespeare does not say it. So Arthur Hugh Clough, in his *Bothie*, represents his hero as making in different words the time-honoured assertion that men love ignorance in women, but does any one believe that Clough lived up to this position? Anyhow, the present point is that it does not matter if men do like it: the business of women is to be candid, to show themselves as they are, and perhaps, in time, men will learn to be candid and natural too. But this comes too near the dangers of new-womanism, and is not directly concerned with the subject.

It is also true that, from various causes, men have very few opportunities for really learning the characters of women, and they are too apt to deduce the general from the particular. A man has a wife who is hysterical and unreasonable, and he unhesitatingly asserts that these are characteristics of women ; or she has no sense of humour, and he innocently supposes that this is because she is a woman.* He may know intimately at least one man with no sense of humour, but he does not argue that this is because he is a man. In regard to this last indictment it must be frankly owned that there is something in it ; though it is hard to have to make this concession to Thackeray. It may to some extent be inherent, but it is certain that many women deliberately stamp upon their sense of humour because they have a vague impression that it is not quite " nice " : they are afraid of being profane, or of laughing at something which ought to be too broad to amuse a woman. It is one of the results of the stock-in-trade theory, by which religion and propriety are insisted upon as requisites of the " eternal feminine."

Two such causes as these—want of candour in women, and of opportunities for observation in men—go far towards accounting for the deficiencies complained of in men's novels ; but it is encouraging to think that both of them can be removed, and that the tendency of modern times is distinctly towards removing them. The other great cause to which allusion has been made—the too-ready acceptance of other people's crude theories—can also be done away with ; but perhaps it may not be accounted unduly pessimistic to say that in this matter there is less cause for hope.

Let us examine a few of the feminine characters of some of the acknowledged masters of fiction. Now it is the fashion to assert that Scott has no capacity for character-drawing, and it is true that most of his heroes and heroines are mere abstractions ; yet there is, after all, less of the accepted cant about women in his novels than in the works of some who are supposed to know better ; the fact being that Scott was a chivalrous gentleman, with a noble simplicity of character, that made him disdain to take for granted the qualities that the keen subtle-minded Thackeray was content to accept. Jeanie Deans, quite apart from the romantic circumstances of her story, is one of the most faithful delineations of feminine character ever made by a man, and it is infinitely to Scott's credit that he has invested with undying interest a person who has so few of the stock attractions of her sex, so few of the conventional vices and virtues—in short, who is so utterly a woman as our honest, kindly, duty-loving Jeanie ; nor are there many examples in fiction of such a consistent working out of a beautiful character to what is usually an uninteresting period of life. Jeanie is, no doubt, Scott's masterpiece, and he does not attain this level in any other character.

From Scott to Thackeray is a gigantic stride ; we leap the gulf
VOL. 149.—NO. 5.

which separates the ancient from the modern novelist, for Scott is, psychologically, as distinctly behind his time as Thackeray is before his. It is perhaps a little late in the day to fall foul of Thackeray's women; every one acknowledges his injustice, his superficiality, his want of sympathetic insight; but we must have our ass's kick at him too. He is, to use an expressive provincialism, "a bit too clever." It is impossible to believe in the immortal Becky, to accept with patience Lady Castlewood, who is a mere embodiment of the list of virtues and vices mentioned above; one resents his patronage of Laura and his other favourites, whom he always despises, even while he praises them. "Don't you know any good women?" says Ethel Newcome to Pendennis; and, indeed, it is a question which might be addressed to Thackeray himself, and his answer should be, "Yes; but they are mostly fools." In fact, he does not know when to stop; his women are at once too consistent and not consistent enough; they have not the *qualités de leurs défauts*. Becky is, in Taine's words, "a petticoated and heartless barrister"; she is an impossibility—no woman's character is so one-sided. Thackeray has assimilated all the ready-made witticisms; he cannot help attributing spite and jealousy even to his beloved Laura; he is delighted to make her show a little "feminine weakness," and the way he gloats over Stella's inability to forgive Vanessa is absolutely indecent, though this only comes in here to illustrate his point of view: it is supposed to belong to the realm of fact.

Dickens can hardly be regarded as a serious portrait-painter; his creatures are mere personifications of some one quality, and it is not worth while to quarrel with him about his wearisomely unselfish women, his pretty little foolish women, his proud, stern, unrelenting women; the story is, as it were, independent of the characters, or rather, one does not talk of the characters in a burlesque or melodrama.

Trollope seems to have gone out of fashion with the novel-reading public, yet he is often honest and original in his conceptions of women, and in one instance at least, that of Lily Dale, he rises far above the ordinary masculine standpoint, and shows us a woman whose noble steadfastness harmonises so perfectly with her sweet tenderness that we can stand up and say to all the world, "This was a woman." At other times, it must be admitted, he allows his women to give way to a conventional tearfulness, and a sort of maudlin talk, which is the more irritating that he can do so much better when he likes.

Besant has written a great many books, but he only has one woman, and she is not a real one. She is beautiful, she is devoted to some good work, she always does the right thing—at least all the other people in the book think so—she leads about a lover who is generally her inferior in every way, and she is distinctly monotonous. This is not to be taken as underrating Besant as a novelist; it is

merely an assertion that, in common with most of his sex, he does not give us any women among his characters.

The chief defect of William Black's women is that they always require an appreciative audience, and he always gives them one. They endure and inflict unnecessary suffering because, instead of using straightforwardness and common-sense, they insist on being heroic and self-denying. In real life they would not be endured; some of them would even be called sulky; but Black almost orders us to admire everything they do because they do it. They are also devoid of humour, even the witty ones, but this is universal, being, in fact, a trait of the "eternal feminine."

In the novels of Marion Crawford, beautiful and sympathetic as many of his delineations are, there is perhaps a little too much of the instinctive, so to speak, the "wisest, virtuous, discreetest, best," because she does it, and apparently for no other reason very often; too much of the audience feeling; too much also of the feeling that unless she is very deeply in love there is nothing much for her to do. Yet we must praise him in that he grasps the inherent steadfastness and tenderness of his virtuous woman; here he is in the highest company and cannot err.

It is perhaps hardly fair to introduce the name of Rudyard Kipling into a list like this, since he has not definitely entered the ranks of the novelists, but one feels that a new note has been struck in the character of Maisie in *The Light that Failed*; her independence has a sort of reality very rare in fiction; it is unromantic, it is perhaps inartistic, but it is certainly true. One could not help trembling for her when she was fetched over to see poor blind Dick; the author knew that she could not love him, being the girl she was, but he might have succumbed to the convention of "pity akin to love," and spoiled his story.

There are two great names in modern fiction which may not be omitted, though they must be mentioned with bated breath and whispering humbleness. We are taught to place implicit faith in Thomas Hardy and George Meredith as novelists of the first rank. With this question we are not at present concerned; our business is with the women of their novels. Let us say at once that Hardy's heroines drive one to vehement protest: they are repulsive; they are, if one can say so, material; they are, in the worst sense, men's women; they have only one idea, or he has only one idea about them—namely, that they are of the feminine gender. This is, of course, flat heresy and the darkest Philistinism, but we are talking about *women*. Does not Mr. Hardy know any "nice" women? or is it only the "nasty" ones that are interesting? They must be beautiful, they must be sensual, they must be selfish. Have we got no further than this at the end of the "so-called nineteenth century," or is Mr. Hardy a reactionary? These strictures apply

only to his heroines, by whom it is natural that we should judge an author; but it would be unfair to ignore the truth and beauty of some of his minor characters, especially in his earlier works: the figure of Marty, in *The Woodlanders*, for instance, is drawn with a wonderful tenderness of feeling.

On the other hand, Meredith's women are actually women, and Meredith himself, as an enthusiastic admirer has declared, the champion of the sex. He looks at women from another standpoint than that of the ordinary male observer; in short, he begins by "clearing his mind of cant," and this is, after all, what we are demanding; he is an artist, a poet; he goes to Nature and looks at her with candid eyes. Hence we get variety in his women, never monotony; the "eternal feminine" is there, but it exists side by side with clearly drawn individuality; he, better than any man, feels for the sufferings and limitations of the sex; he also, better than any other, realises the capabilities which are hidden beneath the covering of what the world demands as the woman's stock-in-trade.

There is a certain largeness in his conceptions of women; none of his heroines exhibit the pettiness and meanness with which we have been so long regaled. He has been accused of depicting and applauding selfishness in women, but after all, perhaps, self-effacement is not our being's end and aim, and it is conceivable that the ethics of the future may permit in women that development of individuality which is almost regarded as praiseworthy in man.

It is perhaps hardly in accordance with the tone of this paper to introduce a mention of Shakespeare's heroines, and it should only be done as one turns to Nature to corroborate one's impressions of the perfections or defects of a landscape painting. It is only necessary to glance for a moment at Desdemona, at Rosalind, at Imogen, at any of his seriously-drawn women, in order to feel the slightness, the superficiality, the tawdriness almost, of many of the accepted heroines, and it is this reflection more than any other that emboldens one to attack them. The more one studies these women, the more one is amazed at the range, the insight, the variety of his conceptions; and perhaps the most astounding thing is that he actually allows them quite a large supply of real, genuine humour, humour of so many kinds, too: broad fun, as in *Mistress Quickly*; keen, strong, intellectual high-spiritedness, as in *Beatrice*; dainty, exuberant fancy, as in *Rosalind*; and with it all, so much spontaneity, "such letting Nature have her way," such an utter absence of the modern craze for that mere smartness which the writer often puts in the mouth of the most unlikely persons, that one feels transported into "an ampler ether, a diviner air," or, to use a hackneyed but always expressive simile, it is like the broad light of day after the sickly glare of lamplight. The tenderness of Shakespeare's women stands out against this healthy background with convincing power: *Rosalind*

was really "many fathoms deep in love" with Orlando; Portia's "You see me, Lord Bassanio," is a speech impossible to a smaller and less wholesome character, and she meant every word of it.

But this is a fascinating subject, and likely to lead to prolixity, and besides, though the many swear by Shakespeare, it is the few who read him, and discussions on characters in books we have not read are almost as boring as descriptions of countries we have not seen. The probability is that readers of the end of this century will go on putting up with the heroines to whom the male novelist has accustomed them, in the same way as our ancestors of the Middle Ages seem to have made no objection to the perspective of the kneeling saints in their stained-glass windows.

FEASTING AT FUNERALS.

SOME DEPARTING SCOTCH BURIAL CUSTOMS.

THE desire for a grand burial is not confined to the aspiring Caledonian alone, but can be traced back in the histories and traditions of the various races who have succeeded each other to the remotest period. Simplicity has now displaced much of the useless ostentation of the past, but certain curious customs yet remain that give to the funeral ceremonies a mournful interest. With the ancients, the funeral observations afforded opportunities for sumptuous banquets, and in many parts of Scotland the disposal of the dead is always considered an event in the life of the rural community.

Education and migration have done much to quicken the intelligence and dispel the superstitions of the peasantry of Scotland; but, less than half a century ago, few of the people could intelligently read and write, and a very large proportion had never been any great distance from their native glens. That was in the days preceding the advent of the railway and the School Board, and rural Scotland now bears little resemblance to what it was before being wakened up by the introduction of these powerful factors in a nation's welfare. Many beliefs and customs now only live in tradition, and afford subjects of interest and investigation alone to the antiquary and the archæologist. The rites and observances performed by the ancient Caledonian at the death of a relative are now neglected and forgotten; they are unfamiliar to the majority of the people at the present time, and will be entirely unknown to a succeeding generation. Under these circumstances a description of a few of the more prominent funeral customs cannot be without interest.

When hope was abandoned and the hour of dissolution drew near, the relatives and more intimate neighbours gathered around the bed to watch the flight of a familiar soul to the unknown "Beyond" of shadows and uncertainty. This watching for death was at one time believed to be necessary to protect the newly released and consequently unprotected soul from the assaults of fairies and other more evil creatures peopling the air, and ever ready to capture and do grievous injury to the soul of the departed when first escaping

from the chrysalis of clay. When the last expiration of breath has been given and the weary heart is for ever still, the watchers sit down in solemn silence for a few minutes before the body is taken possession of by the women to be prepared for the grave-clothes and the coffin. The eyes are closed, and, with the aid of a bandage, the jaw is kept from falling down and the mouth from remaining open. If a female, the hands are crossed upon the breast; if a male, they are extended by the side. After being washed, the body is dressed in spotless underclothing and laid upon a "stretcher." This is a board the length and shape of the body, to straighten out the limbs for fitting into the coffin. It was then taken into a room, and candles were kept burning beside it during three succeeding nights to frighten away any evil thing that might be desirous of working irreparable mischief upon the future welfare of the dead. A plate of salt was placed upon the breast to prevent the body from swelling, and probably bursting, and, being endowed with some supernatural properties, was also supposed to confer other mysterious benefits upon the departed. The clock was stopped, and the mirror and other shining household utensils were carefully covered and concealed. The cat, being a well-known familiar and companion of witches and kindred traffickers in the "black art," was rigorously forbidden the house, and this was done more in the interests of the living than the dead. Some of the relatives or neighbours sat up during the night, and at frequent intervals examined the body, which was covered with a sheet, to make sure that all was well. Until the day succeeding the interment all unnecessary labour was suspended, and relatives and visitors moved about the house in quietness; conversation was done in subdued whispers and with bated breath. The women prepared the grave-clothes and the nearest carpenter made the coffin.

When "kisted," or "coffined," intimation and invitation were given to the neighbours and acquaintances that they were expected to come and take a last look at the deceased; and, as the doing of this was considered as a mark of respect, the observance was generally unfaillingly performed.

Many of the visitors had other objects and interests besides viewing the corpse and offering their sympathy to the bereaved and mourning relatives. Benefits were to be derived from contact with the body, and there were always some ready to take advantage of the opportunity. By touching the deceased objectionable birth-marks might be removed and physical afflictions alleviated, or perhaps cured. When viewing the corpse it was customary to place the hand upon the brow as a preventive of ghostly dreams and unpleasant nocturnal visitations. Three clear days and nights were allowed to intervene between the death and burial, as it was absolutely necessary, in the interests of the departed, that the sun should rise and set on three occasions. This was a precaution not to be

lightly neglected, as direful consequences would result in a violation of the custom and a curtailment of the prescribed period.

The funeral was an event of the greatest importance, and no effort was wanting to ensure the complete success of the customary rites and ceremonies. The day and the hour were notified to all likely to attend, and extensive preparations were carried on for the seemly and fitting reception of the guests. Many attendants and an abundant supply of refreshments were sure indications of great respect and deep affection for the dead; and a stint of either was the greatest insult imaginable to the memory of the departed. The very poorest tried to save money to provide a funeral feast and prevent the necessity of receiving burial at the expense of the parish. For years they would deny themselves the necessities of life, that on the occasion of their departure there might be enough and to spare. The relatives of others, in demonstrating their affections in the usual fashion, would often incur expenses that hampered them for years. Sometimes an hour or two were allowed for refreshments between the "gathering hour" and the "lifting." During that time the stimulating "comforts" were in constant circulation. The nature of these were determined, to some extent, according to the means and resources of the mourners. For those who desired them there were pipes and tobacco and a plentiful allowance of snuff. Ale, with bread and cheese, would be followed with a round of whisky. Variety was obtained by a service of rum and biscuits, to be followed by an offering of brandy and currant-bun, and, to regulate the appetite, a copious supply of wine and short-bread. Several rounds of these "refreshments" were considered to be the necessary and proper thing, and the not infrequent result, as may well be imagined, of so generous a "dram drinking" was that several of the "mourners" were unable to accompany the cortège to the place appointed for interment. Sometimes even a few hours' sleep was necessary before they were able to return to their own homes. Others of the company, not wishing to appear in such a doubtful condition, came provided with a bottle, into which they emptied their allowance of the liquors, and carrying this home, along with a pocketful of the biscuits, they could enjoy their comforts in privacy and at their leisure. The more modest "mourners" tried to justify their use of the "droddy-bottle" by remarking that they wanted to take home a drappie to the wife, who had been fashed wi' a colic, or byous troubled wi' a dwam. When the deceased and the relatives were in good financial circumstances; perhaps as many as half a score of rounds of the various intoxicants were indulged in, and the attendant clergyman was expected to "ask a blessing" before each round.

The extraordinary quantity of "refreshments" consumed on such occasions were often procured at the expense of the future welfare of the family. Sir Walter Scott, in the *Bride of Lammermoor*, has

faithfully narrated how young Edgar Ravenswood exhausted his resources in providing the funeral feast for his father's memory ; and the circumstances, so graphically and pathetically interwoven in that powerful romance, were common to the other parts of Scotland. With the Highland gentry it was an opportunity for unusual extravagance and undoubted debauchery. On one occasion, while the obsequies of a Highland chief were being celebrated, the health of the deceased was proposed as a toast, and was drunken with three times three and Highland honours. When the ceremony was over it was reckoned up that about *sixty gallons* of whisky had been consumed, in addition to large quantities of other potent liquors, such as strong ale, rum of extra strength, brandy, and various kinds of wines. When it was known that a "laird" or landed proprietor was to be buried, all those suffering from "thirsty throat" gathered from near and far. Assuming that the family mansion would, for the occasion, be transformed into a Liberty Hall, "dronthy" individuals came great distances and remained, not to mourn, but to eat and drink as long as the festival lasted, and only took their departure when all was over. After the interment it was customary for a large number of the attendants to return to the abode of the deceased, where tea was served, and, of course, followed by another liberal service of whisky. The women of the district had all been treated to an afternoon tea-party on the night preceding the day of the funeral. On such an opportunity the theme of conversation was discussing and generally adversely criticising their absent neighbours. Not infrequently these funeral tea-parties developed into violent female quarrels, and after recapitulating the failings of each other's ancestors, degenerated into personal and physical castigations. When the mourners returned from the place of interment, the nearest relative carried in the two chairs on which the coffin had rested before the "lifting," as it would have been considered risky and a tempting of Providence to have removed them before the return of the mourners. For the same reason the blinds were kept down over the windows until the chairs were carried into the house.

The coffin was carried to the graveyard on handspokes, and the employment of a hearse was for long resisted, it being the prevalent opinion that the employment of horses would result in unforeseen disaster. When the corpse had to be conveyed for a considerable distance, as was generally the case, the bearers were fairly exhausted before their task was done.

As may be imagined, the extraordinary indulgence in spirituous liquors often led to unfortunate and ludicrous consequences. Free fights were frequent, and attendance at one funeral often prepared a victim for another. Sometimes the procession started without the corpse, which had been forgotten, and occasionally the coffin would be dropped on the way to the graveyard. Within recent years at a

northern town, a funeral party, when a hearse and cabs were employed, discovered on arrival at the cemetery that it had been neglected to put the coffin containing the remains into the hearse; and on another such occasion at the same town, the intoxicated mourners became so outrageously quarrelsome and bellicose that several of them had to be taken in charge by the police and detained until they were somewhat sobered. Many such instances of a similar character are narrated as having occurred in other districts of the country. There are also many floating traditions about grand funerals which are far from redounding to the credit or testifying to the sobriety of the populace.

All attempts at reforming these barbarous proceedings were for long vigorously resisted, and it is only in recent years, with the spread of a more liberal education and an increase of general knowledge, that an appreciable improvement has been effected.

In olden times the paupers were not afforded a coffin when consigned to the earth. For such, the parish provided a "stock" coffin, having a movable hinged bottom fastening with a bolt. The body was conveyed to the churchyard in this slip-coffin, and held over the mouth of the grave, the bolt was withdrawn, and the body allowed to tumble into the hole to be covered with earth; while the box was removed and kept in readiness for another tenant. It is gratifying to know that this inhuman practice has been discontinued.

The suicide was disposed of in an even more revolting manner than the pauper. In such a case even the pauper slip-coffin was not employed. At the dead hour of night the corpse was dragged to the march-boundary between two parishes, or at two cross-roads, and there bundled into a pit dug for its reception. A stake was driven through the body, and the lonely grave was left unmarked and unattended or adorned for all time, testifying to the wrath of God and the condemnation of man. The mob would have risen in rebellion to have prevented Christian rites and hallowed interment in consecrated ground to the remains of the self-destroyer. Such a violation of God's express will, and a desecration of the hallowed ground reserved for the faithful, was not to be permitted—not even thought of.

"Wraiths" ghost-candles, dead-lights, and numberless other manifestations of the graciousness or malignity of the unseen world, played an important part on every occasion when a death occurred. Spirits of fire and air were particularly active, and the plaintive cry of the water wraiths reverberated through the mist-enshrouded glens. Death warnings were frequently given, and "foregoes" were often seen traversing the road along which the funeral cortège would pass. Every kind of "visitation" that the resources of superstition could imagine and devise were called into requisition, and the peasantry emulated each other in the narration of tales dealing with the

horrible and awful. If they had not actually seen the ghostly manifestations themselves, they always knew some one else who had been more fortunate and favoured and done so.

Such were some of the older customs and observances religiously performed on the occasion of a funeral in Scotland. They were relics of a ruder barbarism, only now being slowly driven out; the rites of a religion believed and practised in the childhood of humanity. They were mischievous in their effects and ruinous in their results. On occasions the most momentous in the family circle, when the soul is sad and the heart heavy and sore with mourning and tribulation, they introduced strife and contention into the sacred penetralia of the domestic hearth. They were frequently the promoters of public disorder and social disturbance. They were no indications of respect and sincere sympathy with the memory of the dead, and only served to gratify the vulgar appetites of a callous crowd. They were the concomitant results of an old and unenlightened superstition, and were unquestionably more honoured in the breach than in the observance. They often revived and embittered old and seemingly forgotten family feuds; and they blighted the souls of the survivors with the evil shadow of superstition. Times change. The new generation is generally more intelligent and enlightened than its predecessor, and the unhealthy shadows of the past are being slowly but surely swept away. Education is the motive power of the mind, and the world of man is ever sweetened more and more by the liberal and unrestricted dissemination of the universal inheritance.

Outward and ostentatious display is no indication of a sincere affection, and the loudest sobs are generally the soonest still. Incongruous hospitality is uncalled for, and is generally prompted by vanity and not affection. Death is the natural and inevitable completion of life when the heart is weary and the powers outworn; it comes to all, and man can mourn with mortality alone, and sympathise without superstition.

JAMES DOWMAN.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

SCIENCE.

ANOTHER volume of the University Tutorial Series has been issued,¹ and contains in a remarkably small space a great amount of information upon general elementary science. The book is divided into three sections, the first dealing with mechanics, the second with heat, light, and electricity, and the third with chemistry. Of course it is impossible in so small a space to deal with each of these branches of science in anything like a complete manner; but, on the whole, the work of condensation has been well carried out, and the student will obtain a fair idea of the salient points of the subjects mentioned. The index, however, referring as it does to the paragraphs instead of the pages of the book, does not facilitate the work of reference, especially as there are practically three volumes.

Under the somewhat misleading title of *A Manual of Mental Science*,² what is really a treatise on phrenology has recently appeared. From its many predecessors this book differs slightly in that some account is given of modern biological progress so far as it bears upon the subject, and photographic methods have been employed to produce the numerous illustrations. Most of the illustrations, however, are of children, in which the various cranial peculiarities cannot be so fully developed as in adults. In common with all books of this kind this work fails to show any connection between the faculties supposed to be indicated by certain developments of the skull and those actually possessed by the individual chosen as an illustration. While the book may be of interest to students of phrenology, we cannot say that it marks any forward step in mental science.

Numerous have been, and still are, the efforts to explain the phenomena connected with light, heat, and electricity, and to unite them with each other as manifestations of some common source of energy. Another such effort has recently been made,³ in which the author endeavours to show that a force which he terms "electrogene" embodies the collective properties of electricity, heat, light, and

¹ *General Elementary Science*. Edited by W. Briggs. London: W. B. Clive.

² *A Manual of Mental Science*. By J. A. Fowler. London: L. N. Fowler & Co. 1897.

³ *Views on some of the Phenomena of Nature*. By J. Walker. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd. 1898.

magnetism. Mr. Walker returns to the old materialistic view of heat, as he says: "Heat is as truly a created thing as matter is." With Joule's conclusion that heat is a mode of motion the author does not agree, and we can only regret that he omits all reference to the experimental data upon which this conclusion is based. Many references are made to comets, indeed a whole chapter is devoted to those mysterious celestial bodies; but, as we understand the author's reasoning, we cannot say that we know more about them now than before we read that chapter. There are many original observations interspersed throughout the work, and Mr. Walker is evidently free from scientific bias towards the generally accepted scientific theories. From this point of view the book may be recommended to those who are apt to assume that a theory must be true because it is generally accepted.

The intimate connection between science and practice is nowhere more apparent than in the various handbooks containing the different data upon which special industries are based. One of these, relating to the manufacture and use of gas, now lies before us.¹ In it the gas engineer will find all the scientific information which he may require for his calculations, the numerous tables and memoranda being rendered easily accessible by means of an excellent index. Most of the information given is of a thoroughly practical character and we can strongly recommend this pocket-book to all those who have to do with the manufacture or use of gas.

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

It is now four years since the appearance of Professor Shield Nicholson's first volume of his *magnum opus*, *Principles of Political Economy*,² and the friends of the Edinburgh professor will regret to learn that the second volume has been delayed owing to the author's severe and protracted illness. The present contribution deals with exchange, with the exception of the full examination of the opposing policies of free trade and protection, for the treatment of which we must wait for the concluding book of this work, which will consider the general principles of finance and of governmental interference.

Perhaps the two questions of most interest at the present moment treated in the volume before us are those of capital and labour and bimetallism.

In the chapter entitled "Cost in Relation to Wages and Profit,"

¹ *The Gas Engineer's Pocket-book.* By H. O'Connor. Crosby Lockwood & Son. 1898.

² *Principles of Political Economy.* By J. Shield Nicholson, M.A., D.Sc., Professor of Political Economy in the University of Edinburgh. Vol. II.—Book III. London: Adam and Charles Black. 1897.

Professor Nicholson foreshadows the result of the great engineering lock-out in these words—viz. : “ A rapid increase of capital may both theoretically and actually raise the rate of wages generally and depress the rate of profit ; but it does not follow that a rapid succession of strikes would have similar consequences. In the first place, combinations of labour would be met by combinations of capital, and the latter might prove the stronger.”

Upon the question of collective bargaining, the Professor submits that it is impossible “ to determine on general theoretical grounds whether labour or capital is likely to gain most ” by this method. But for these combinations, he says, the history of British industry for the first half of this century seems to confirm the view that wages would have been depressed considerably below the normal rate. For competition of labour and strict combination of capital, he adds, would obviously depress wages, and he arrives at the conclusion “ that the method of collective bargaining by voluntary combinations may under existing conditions be the best method in many industries of securing the true market price of labour.”

These opinions, coming from such a strong individualist as the Professor, are the more valuable at the present moment when trades unions are once more being put upon their trial and their fundamental principles attacked.

The chapter on bimetallism is one of the best we have seen on this question, dealing fairly and squarely with this most difficult problem, setting out the facts succinctly and clearly, pointing out the real and alleged disadvantages of the system, and showing the advantages under certain conditions. Professor Nicholson is a bimetallist, but he writes as impartially upon this question as upon others, and does not allow his economic theories to blind him to the political and social factors of every-day life. The financiers of England, he concludes, may possibly prefer the adoption of international bimetallism to the adoption of a silver standard by the United States.

In the chapter on the theory of foreign trade, Professor Nicholson has had the valuable assistance of that able economist, Professor Bastable, the well-known author of *The Theory of International Trade*.

The Social Mind and Education,¹ by Mr. George Edgar Vincent, is an attempt to reduce the present chaotic system of education to some sort of unity and greater definiteness of purpose. “ In the process of social evolution,” says Mr. Vincent, “ men’s ideas, judgments, and desires have been combined into products which, transmitted from generation to generation, react upon individuals, and are in turn modified by them. These ‘ capitalisations of experience ’ and their unceasing reactions form what may be described as the

¹ *The Social Mind and Education*. By George Edgar Vincent, Assistant Professor of Sociology in the University of Chicago. New York: The Macmillan Company. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd. 1897.

social mind." Physical, vital, mental and social phenomena have been analysed and consolidated into their respective departments, which are now seen to be subordinate to the science of society, now becoming recognised as the *scientia scientiarum*, a true philosophy. "Modern social philosophy" is, says Mr. Vincent, "the latest conscious synthesis of the social mind . . . social philosophy comprehends society by organising into a unity these elements of analysis." For the individual to attain to a knowledge of social philosophy, to grasp the unity of social life and conduct, it is not necessary that he should strictly adhere to the development of the race. There are "shortcuts" by which in individual evolution whole stages of the race's growth may be omitted. The parallel of development theory is open to criticism. As Mr. Vincent rightly says: "The real parallel is in the process, the progress from analysis to synthesis, and in the gradual development of fully self-conscious effort out of vaguely conscious activity." That the individual may become an organic part of society is the aim of education. In earlier years the education of the student may be based upon analysis, the study of subjects and separate disciplines, but these must later be co-ordinated by the process of combination or integration into a coherent theory of the phenomena of his daily life. The definite aim of higher education, says Mr. Vincent, is "to direct the student to a purposeful integration of his various pursuits, a putting back of those abstractions into a concrete conception of life."

Such is the author's argument and purpose, based upon the same principle as Mr. Lester Ward's *Dynamic Sociology*. It is a thoughtful and scientific treatise which we can confidently recommend to all educationalists.

In *The Jewish Law of Divorce according to Bible and Talmud*¹ Mr. David Werner Amram reminds us of Sir Henry Maine's dictum that in the eighteenth century "there was but one body of primitive records which was worth studying—the early history of the Jews." And if this is true of the Hebrew Scriptures, it is, says Mr. Amram, still more true of the body of Jewish law preserved in the Talmud and Rabbinical writings. These two bodies of law may be compared with statutory and case law, or with written and unwritten law respectively. Both, according to tradition, commenced with Moses. The Pentateuch (Torah) was the written or statutory law, and the oral or case law was a contemporaneous commentary, commenced by Moses and continued by subsequent lawgivers, upon the Torah. This latter body of law was from time to time codified, and two codes, the Mishnah and the Gemara, are together known as the Talmud. The attempt, therefore, as Mr. Amram rightly contends, to study the

¹ *The Jewish Law of Divorce according to Bible and Talmud*. With some reference to its development in post-Talmudic times. By David Werner Amram (University of Penns.), member of the Philadelphia Bar. London: David Nutt. 1897.

law of the Bible without the aid of the Talmud is to endeavour to understand the character of a nation by reading its statute-book, and by disregarding the judicial interpretation and application of its laws to the daily life of the people.

This system of law, which had its rise before the beginning of Roman law, and which still regulates the life and conduct of several millions of men, should no longer be neglected, as has hitherto been too much the case, by the student of comparative jurisprudence; and Mr. Amram has, in our opinion, most successfully filled a gap in one branch of Jewish jurisprudence, and that a most important one. To those who base their opposition to divorce upon the few isolated *dicta* to be found in the Bible, the Jewish law, as laid down in the Talmud, and as recognised in practice, is an unanswerable reply. As Mr. Amram says, "The Jewish law recognised the validity of divorce in all cases, and sought to prevent its abuse by moral injunction and judicial regulation."

The evolution of the Jewish law of divorce has followed the normal course since the patriarchal system flourished, when the husband alone had an unrestricted right of divorce, to modern times, when the wife has nearly succeeded in obtaining reciprocal rights.

A bibliography, glossary, and full index complete this admirable treatise.

The Real Representative Law, 1897,¹ by Dr. Amherst D. Tyssen, deals with that portion of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, which amends the law of representation to real estate. Hitherto real estate devised by will has gone directly to the devisee without any power for the personal representative to meddle with it, and on intestacy the estate has descended direct to the heir-at-law. By the new Act real estate, so far as it is freehold, becomes in each case vested in the personal representative, who will be able to sell or mortgage it in order to pay the debts of the deceased. There can be no question that this reform will be warmly welcomed. This is a sound piece of work, and can be safely commended to practitioners.

In *The London University Guide for the Year 1897-8*,² will be found all the information necessary for the guidance of a student from his matriculation to his final graduateship, together with the calendar of the University Correspondence College.

PAMPHLETS.

To Teach the Negro History: A Suggestion,³ by Mr. John Stephens Durham, consists of an historical examination of the relations of the

¹ *The Real Representative Law*, 1897. Being Part I. of the Land Transfer Act, 1897, and a Discussion on Administration thereunder. By Amherst D. Tyssen, D.C.L., Barrister-at-Law. London: William Clowes & Sons. 1898.

² *The London University Guide for the Year 1897-98*. London: The University Correspondence College Press.

³ *To Teach the Negro History: A Suggestion*. By John Stephens Durham, B.S., C.E. Philadelphia: David MacKay.

negro in the political and industrial system of the United States, and of suggestions for the best method of training the growing generation about to enter into competition with the white man. This question is of the greatest importance, and Mr. Durham's paper is full of interest.

The Press and the Post Office: An Appeal to Parliament,¹ by the Rêv. Charles Bullock, contains the arguments for the reform of the present ridiculous charges exacted for the carriage of unregistered newspapers or printed matter by the G.P.O. The reform advocated by Mr. Bullock should have the entire support of the press and of all interested in the cheap transmission of literature.

*The Matriculation Directory*² for 1898, of University Correspondence College, in addition to a calendar, contains articles on the special subjects for the January and June examinations of next year.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

is written with great knowledge of a vast subject, and with a power of appreciating the French point of view which makes his work specially valuable. The proofs were, before publication, read by some distinguished Frenchmen, including M. Paul Leroy-Beaulieu, M. Richard Waddington, and M. Camille Barrère. When Mr. Bodley was talking to the late Cardinal Manning about his projected work, the Cardinal said, "It is like writing the history of a kaleidoscope." This was an ingenious and felicitous way of expressing a fact. In the introductory chapters the author attributes the pessimistic spirit prevalent in France under the Third Republic to the disastrous issue of the war with Prussia. We believe this is a short-sighted view. Materialism has long been working its way, for good or ill, into French thought, and this, perhaps more than the war, is the true genesis of the existing pessimism. Mr. Bodley considers that the work of the Revolution culminated in Napoleon, and he goes so far as to say that the Napoleonic fabric of centralisation could not be demolished "without bringing down with it every institution in France with havoc more ruinous than that of 1789, and to build another structure another Napoleon would be needed."*. This statement, too, appears to us rather overstrained. The comparison of the German and French political systems is very striking, Mr. Bodley manifestly regarding France as affording an object of greater international interest. The study of French Socialism, in the second volume, is full of interest. What we most miss

¹ *The Press and the Post Office*. By the Rev. Charles Bullock, B.D. London: *The News Offices*.

² *Matriculation Directory*. London: University Correspondence College. 1897.

³ *France*. By John Edward Courtenay Bodley. Two Vols. London: Macmillan and Co.

in this admirable work is a practical view of the economic conditions of modern France.

The career of Mirabeau¹ is one well worthy of special biographical treatment. He was, in spite of his faults, one of the greatest Frenchmen that ever lived. Mr. P. F. Willert has presented us with a study of the great orator and statesman which leaves no important feature in his varied and stormy life untouched. The account of his early irregularities reads like a chapter in romance. The record of his political career is not quite as elaborate as one might desire, but it would take a much larger volume to do justice to Mirabeau's work as a statesman. We are inclined to think that the student of Carlyle's *French Revolution* would get a more vivid impression of what the man really was, but Mr. Willert prefers to avoid the dramatic style of narrative—and perhaps he is wise. His biography is, though not very forcible in point of form, full of valuable information. Moreover, it clearly brings out the fact that Mirabeau was a practical statesman.

We have received the fifth volume of the *British Empire in the Nineteenth Century*.² It is really a storehouse of well-digested facts. The account given of the history of the British Colonies is very full and nothing of importance is omitted.

We must, perhaps, include *A Comic History of Greece*³ in this section, though travesties of history are not very desirable at any time. There is some cleverness in this book, which we must regard as a new specimen of American humour. There is, at the same time, a certain puerility about the verbal witticisms. Take, for example, this sentence: "The soil of Greece was principally the result of contact with the Persians, who soiled everything on which they laid hands." The illustrations, though sometimes grotesque, are very original, and remind us of some of Thackeray's most daring efforts in the way of pictorial caricature.

*The Age of Charlemagne*⁴ is a book which may be read with pleasure by either students of history or of theology. The author, Dr. Charles L. Wells, is Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. He thoroughly understands his subject, and though he takes a rather contracted view of the history and development of the Papacy, he attempts to give "reasons for the faith that is in him." Dr. Wells has consulted numerous authorities, including the works of Maitz, Hinschens, and Mullinger.

¹ *Mirabeau*. By P. F. Willert, M.A. (Foreign Statesmen Series.) London: Macmillan & Co.

² *The British Empire in the Nineteenth Century*. Vol. V. By Edgar Sanderson, M.A. London: Blackie & Son.

³ *A Comic History of Greece*. Illustrated by Charles M. Irydes. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company.

⁴ *The Age of Charlemagne*. By Charles L. Wells, Ph.D. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

BELLES LETTRES.

MR. GEORGE GISSING'S book on *Charles Dickens*¹ is rather self-contradictory. For instance, in the chapter dealing with Dickens as a story-teller, Mr. Gissing, while expressing the view that *Martin Chuzzlewit* is the popular novelist's greatest work, admits that it surpasses all the other novels in the "theatrical conventionality" of its closing scene. Moreover, the style of the novel is condemned. How, then, can it be called Dickens's greatest work? The truth is Dickens wrote no *great* work. From first to last he was a caricaturist. *Pickwick*, a collection of farcical scenes, not a novel, is his best effort. Again, why does Mr. Gissing point out the incongruities of *Dombey and Son*, and yet water down his criticism so as to appear to praise the work? This is rather disingenuous. What he should have said—and what, we suspect, he meant to say—was that the only artistic portion of the book was the sketch of Little Paul, and that all the rest was absurd melodrama. The big question remains—Are Dickens's characters true to life? Or rather, Are they real in any sense? If not, then Dickens's position as a novelist is necessarily very low. His reputation cannot last if his novels are artistically unsound. Mr. Gissing all but acknowledges that this is the case, but he stops short of condemning Dickens as an artist. He praises the novelist's "strenuousness," as if mere hard work and resolution could ever make a writer of ill-constructed stories, full of false characterisation, a true artist. While, however, we take exception to some portions of Mr. Gissing's "critical study," we must speak highly of the admirable manner in which it is written. The critic probably wished not to be too severe on the faults of a brother novelist. While we admire his charitableness, we might remind him that the interests of literature should not suffer through sympathetic weakness.

A volume entitled *Novels and Novelists*,² dealing with the Waverley Novels from a bibliographical and critical point of view, and also with the works of Bulwer Lytton, Disraeli, and other writers of fiction, will be read with interest. The author takes the conventional view of Scott—that he is the foremost English novelist. Recent criticism has helped to demolish this grossly exaggerated estimate of the Scottish romancer. Mr. W. D. Howells has avowed that he has a very poor opinion of Scott. It is, however, not necessary to deny the unquestionable merits of the author of *Waverley* and *The Heart of Midlothian* (really his best work) in order to determine his proper place in English literature. To compare Scott with Shakespeare,

¹ *Charles Dickens. A Critical Study.* By George Gissing. London: Blackie and Son.

² *Novels and Novelists.* Chapters on the Waverley Novels and other Novel Articles. London: W. H. Allen & Co.

whom he does not resemble at all, is most absurd. In style, in greatness of conception, and in psychological insight he was much inferior to George Eliot. Not one of Scott's historical novels is equal—at least, from an artistic standpoint—to *Romola*, or to Reade's *Cloister and the Hearth*, or to Thackeray's *Esmond*. Of course it would be idle to maintain that *Quentin Durward*, for example, is a work of as much power as Hugo's *Notre Dame*. Nevertheless, Scott has done some good work as a novelist, and perhaps, after all, his worshippers, by ignoring his defects and not accurately appreciating his strong points, have done more harm than good to his literary fame.

The volume of Victor Hugo's *Correspondance*¹ cannot fail to interest all who admire that great writer's works and who wish to know as much as possible about his life and opinions. In the very first page we come across a thoroughly Hugoesque description of Mont-Saint-Michel: "Un place bien étrange que ce Mont-Saint-Michel. Autour de nous, partout à perte de vue, l'espace infini l'horizon bleu de la mer, l'horizon vert de la terre, les nuages, l'air, la liberté, les oiseaux ailes, les vaisseaux à toutes voiles; et puis tout à coup, là, dans une crete de vieux mur, au dessus de nos têtes, à travers une fenêtre grillée, la pale figure d'un prisonnier." The correspondence covers a period extending from 1836 to 1882. Hugo's critical acumen is shown in a letter from him to Jules Lacroix on the question of how Shakespeare could best be translated—whether into Alexandrine verses or, as in English, partly into verse and partly into prose. He advises his friend thus: "Faites un tissu homogène," and then he says: "Dans la langue française, il y a un abîme entre la prose et les vers; en anglais, c'est à peine s'il y a une différence." Of course, to deny that there is such a thing as English prose, when we have a Swift, an Addison, a Goldsmith, and a Pater would be absurd in a literal sense; but Victor Hugo realised the advantage possessed by the Latin language in having a rigid line of demarcation drawn between prose and poetry. We find in the correspondence a sympathetic but very brief letter to the composer Berlioz. Writing to Louis Boulanger about a domestic calamity, he says: "Je vous écris, le desespoir au cœur vous êtes mon ami, il faut bien que je partage cette douleur avec vous." When one reads some of Hugo's extravagant phrases, one is inclined to feel that Balzac, a very different type of French writer, would have suspected a touch of insincerity in such high-flown expressions of emotion. Still it is evident that the author of *Les Misérables* was a man of deep feeling, a true friend, and a most affectionate husband and father. Some of his letters to his wife are very beautiful specimens of epistolary literature. Amongst his correspondents were George Sand, Michelet, Lamartine, and Baudé-

¹ *Victor Hugo—Correspondance* (1836-1882). Paris: Calmann Lévy.

laire. He writes to acknowledge the latter's volume of poems, *Les Fleurs du Mal*, which he describes as "votre beau livre." In a subsequent letter he congratulates Baudelaire on his article on Theophile Gautier. There is also a letter to Mr. Swinburne, thanking the English poet *ex imo corde* for "votre magnifique travail sur mon livre." Is not this very like a case of "mutual admiration"? Though the volume extends to 380 pages, it would seem that the publishers found it necessary to select from the vast heap of correspondence the most important of the letters.

In spite of a certain atmosphere of conventionality, there is some genuine merit in Mira Sandeman's novel, *The Infatuation of Amanda*.¹ The conclusion of the story is rather unreal, but we presume the writer does not desire to be regarded as a realist.

In this age when electricity is making such tremendous progress, an electrical dictionary is a very useful book of reference. The want has been supplied by Mr. T. O'Connor Sloane,² who has evidently devoted much study to the subject. Nearly every topic connected with electricity is dealt with succinctly in the volume. For instance, under the head of "Electrical Death," we get an account of the mode of execution by electricity, and the subject of "Magnetisation" is discussed under various sub-headings in the course of three pages. The volume is, in fact, a mine of information.

We have received the second volume of *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*.³ This volume contains the essays of Berkeley in *The Guardian*, "An Essay towards Preventing the Ruin of Great Britain," and "Alciphron," in which all the phases of religious criticism in the author's time are exhibited in the persons of the two infidel interlocutors. In "Alciphron" will be found many beautiful passages.

An Open-Eyed Conspiracy,⁴ by Mr. William Dean Howells, is perhaps not quite equal to the American novelist's best works. It is a more or less elaborate sketch of the chain of events which begin with a beautiful but unsophisticated American girl's introduction to Saratoga society—such as it is—and ends with a marriage of the unconventional sort. The story is capitably told, the narrator being the editor of *Every Other Week*, presumably a magazine or newspaper. Mr. Howells has the incommunicable gift of style. What has been said of Goldsmith would apply to him: "Nihil letigit quad non ornavit." We may, therefore, regard this little story as a mere fugitive effort, and admire its simple charm as a narrative.

¹ *The Infatuation of Amanda*. By Mira Sandeman. London: Digby, Long & Co.

² *The Standard Electrical Dictionary*. By T. O'Connor Sloane, A.M., E.M., Ph.D. London: Crosby Lockwood & Son.

³ *The Works of George Berkeley, Bishop of Cloyne*. Edited by George Sampson. Vol. II. London: George Bell & Sons.

⁴ *An Open-Eyed Conspiracy*. An Idyll of Saratoga. By William Dean Howells. Edinburgh: David Douglas.

*Hearts that are Lightest*¹ is the title of a volume by Monti de Gomara. There are two tales in the volume. The second story, "Within the City Walls," is better than that which gives the book its title; but certainly that is not saying much for it.

The author of *The Secret of a Hollow Tree*,² a Welsh novel, considers his work important enough to have a preface. The story is far too much spun out, and, though we are informed in the preface that the personages who figure in it are "true pictures of life," we are afraid Naunton Covertside has not learned the art of delineating character.

The University Tutorial Series should prove most useful to students generally. We have received an edition of Plato's dialogue, *Laches*,³ which gives the text, with an excellent introduction and notes.

We have also received the *Ninth Book of Livy*,⁴ which is well edited by Mr. W. J. Woodhouse, M.A. The text is beautifully printed, and the notes explain obscure historical allusions or translate difficult passages.

*The Fatal Phil*⁵ is an interesting story. It is a pity that the author, Mr. G. Beresford Fitzgerald, has such a weakness for long sentences, for this tendency rather vitiates his style. The openings of some of his chapters are almost Thackerayan, but without any of Thackeray's limpid simplicity. The book is superior to a great deal of the fiction of the day, and the characters in the novel are forcibly portrayed.

ART.

MR. BATSFORD has added to his list of decorative art publications a handsome folio volume of forty *Examples of Old Furniture, English and Foreign*,⁶ drawn and described by Mr. Alfred Ernest Chancellor. "In making this selection my aim has been to cover as wide a range as possible, more especially of English work, and to portray not only typical examples of any well-defined period, but also unique specimens and uncommon varieties, which derive additional interest from some charm of singularity or freshness of idea." The English examples are chosen from the Tudor, Stuart and Jacobean, Cromwellian, William and Mary, and eighteenth century periods, with

¹ *Hearts that are Lightest*. By M. de Gomara. London: Digby, Long & Co.

² *The Secret of a Hollow Tree*. By Naunton Covertside. London: Digby, Long and Co.

³ *Plato Laches*. Edited by F. G. Plaistowe, M.A. Lond. and Camb., and T. R. Mills, M.A. London: W. B. Clive.

⁴ *Livy. Book IX*. Edited by W. J. Woodhouse, M.A. London: W. B. Clive.

⁵ *The Fatal Phil*. By G. Beresford Fitzgerald. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁶ *Examples of Old Furniture, English and Foreign*. Drawn and described by Alfred Ernest Chancellor. London: B. T. Batsford. 1898.

THE
WESTMINSTER REVIEW.

VOL. CXLIX. NO. 6.—JUNE 1898.

HOME RULE IN INDIA.

THE calamities which have been lately desolating the Indian Empire have kindled in us a variety of emotions, but cannot have left many of us cold. Officials have been roused to strenuous labour, malcontents have brought charges against officials, and the average British citizen has felt bewildered between them, and called—more or less loudly—for some reform or other; on one point alone all must be agreed—that the sixtieth year of an illustrious sovereignty has been defaced by the suffering state of the greatest portion of her Majesty's subjects. At such a moment it may not be entirely otiose to look a little into the nature of the British Crown's supremacy in India, to inquire what degree of responsibility it involves, and to see how that responsibility is met.

The general idea of the Indian Empire is that the East India Company conquered the country under Clive and Warren Hastings; that the Company was dissolved in consequence of the troubles of '57, and that the Crown then took over the government, reforming all the abuses and corruptions of the old mercantile administration. But this outline must be corrected and filled in with a little detail before the true aspect of Indian affairs can be perceived. From the beginning of the eighteenth century to the date of Pitt's Act in 1784 the Company was certainly powerful and independent, but it was not entirely, or even mainly, a conquering body. Ever since the United Provinces had determined to throw off the yoke of Spain, the Dutch had been sending ships to the East to procure pepper for their tables and nitre for their powder-mills. Towards the end of Elizabeth's reign the English had become their imitators and rivals; but during the feeble and troubled reigns of the Stuart kings the

Dutch had usually kept the upper hand in these adventures. Driven from the straits and islands of equatorial India, the English traders turned away and sought refuge on the coasts of the mainland, until, when peace and good government had been restored, and a Dutch king occupied the throne in the Painted Chamber of Westminster, ardent debates on the extension of Eastern commerce began to shake the English Parliament. These debates will be found vividly summarised in Macaulay's *History of England*; for the present purpose it will be enough to note that at the very end of the reign of William III. a charter was issued to the United, or English, Company of Merchants trading to the East Indies, who assumed a coat of arms with the motto, "Auspicio Regis et Senatus Angliæ." Territorial acquisition was no part of the Company's commission, and for the best part of half a century their agents in India were content with factories, warehouses, and offices at a few points on the maritime edges of the land, somewhat in the same way as treaty-ports are still maintained in China. But to establish treaty-ports the first necessity is, obviously, a valid power with which to make treaties; and in the rapid decomposition of the Moghul Empire the impossibility of anything of the sort gradually made itself clear. Theoretically, the seat of that empire was at Delhi, and the rulers of the several provinces were only viceroys or lieutenants of the Emperor. Accordingly, the Company's agents endeavoured for a time to protect their operations by patents from Delhi and minor arrangements with the local governors.

Before the middle of the century, however, the French, always foremost in new paths, struck in, and fierce contests raged in the south-east of India. Then the Nawab of Bengal attacked Calcutta and was overthrown by a little force of disciplined troops employed by the Company at Plassey. Eight years later the Company's servants obtained from the titular Emperor a commission to administer Bengal; but even then no territorial expansion was intended. Clive was well aware in 1765 of the ease with which a march might be made up the country, and the wandering heir restored at Delhi under British protection. But, after the battle of Buxar in 1765 and the acquisition of Bengal and Bihar, he gave up the Company's remaining conquests and pronounced that "to go further were a scheme so extravagantly ambitious and absurd that no Governor and Council in their senses can adopt it unless the whole system of the Company's interest be first entirely new remodelled."¹ Warren Hastings, the other alleged founder, never annexed or conquered, unless the assumption of a few forts and fields that fell in by the misconduct of their holders can be so considered. The second map in Sir A. Lyall's work quoted below shows that at

¹ *Committee Report*, quoted in Sir A. Lyall's *Rise of British Dominion*.

the end of his rule in 1784 only Bengal and Bihar, with the strip of coast from Ganjam to Masulipatam, the Madras Jāgir, and the island of Bombay, bear the red colour of British power. But in 1784 came a notable change. In that year Warren Hastings laid down his office and Pitt's Bill became law, by which a Parliamentary Board was made supreme in Indian affairs with a committee of four directors of the Company for subordinate agents, the political convenience of this arrangement being that a member of the Royal Cabinet had ultimate power, while the blame could still be thrown on the Company whenever things went wrong. The first Governor-General of British India who was appointed under the arrangement was a nobleman who had served, though not with much glory, as a military man in America; Oriental experience he had none. Cornwallis was by no means a man of extreme aggressiveness; nevertheless it is remarkable that with his appointment began the forward policy which has ended as we see. It does not necessarily follow that a parliamentary rule must be one of conquest; indeed, the statesmen of that day—Pitt and Dundas—were most abstemious and conscientious in their professions and instructions. But there is the fact. In Sir George Birdwood's very valuable *Report on Indian Office Records* (p. 251) will be found a list of territorial acquisitions made in the Company's name from 1781 down to 1858, from which it is quite clear that the British flag was carried over a great part of Southern India by Cornwallis and over a great part of Northern India by his successor, Wellesley, while the Board of Control and its "Secret Committee" continued to breathe caution from London. Nor can it be fairly pleaded that these things were only due to the distance and the delay of communications: there was the overland mail in Dalhousie's days, and no one made more annexations than Dalhousie. At the same time a non-acquisitive school was always open in the country and even at home. The illustrious soldier-brother who was Wellesley's right hand in all his wars, and several of the officials formed in Wellesley's own office, were opposed to aggression; nay, Wellesley himself recorded his conviction that it was only the duty of his Government to "resist unjust attacks," and that it ought to be "equally determined to respect the just rights of other States as to maintain its own." Sir Thomas Munro even denounced the "subsidiary system" introduced by Wellesley as tending to demoralise the Native States; Mountstuart Elphinstone and Sir John Malcolm held similar opinions; the Marquis of Hastings only aimed at making the British Government paramount over the other Powers. Thus there has always been a force acting, though not always with equal strength, against the aggressive or expansive energy, and the net result has been: (1) that at this day over one-third of the territory of India is still under native rule; and

(2) that the inhabitants of this large section of the Indian peninsula are as numerous as the population of Germany and France combined. But, if it be true that conquest is over and the idea of annexation obsolete, we cannot go on to say that the spirit of encroachment is altogether flown. There will probably be found among individual citizens and even among well-informed experts a representation of two extreme opinions. There will be a number of optimistic experts who will magnify their office. British administration has doubtless been beneficial in many ways to India: cruel practices have been put down; and a penal code has been introduced which is not only a fine work of legislation but tends to become a kind of scriptural authority and standard of morals. Perhaps no other single achievement equals this; but universities have been founded, manufactories established, commerce has been extended and peace maintained—all noble contributions to human welfare. On the other hand, there are critics, some of them not less well informed than the experts, who point to a pullulating population of paupers of whom nearly 30 per cent. are dependent on agriculture under treacherous skies, alarmed and harassed by laws which they cannot understand, and fiscal demands which, though not heavy, are inevitable as laws of nature. All this makes the continued existence of Native States alike useful and interesting. Their usefulness arises out of the faculty that they have of offering a career to indigenous ability; such men as Salar Jung, Dinkar Rao, and T. Madhava Rao in British India would have perhaps been deputy collectors or judges of small causes; in Native States they proved rulers and reformers whose fame went beyond Indian limits. And a special interest arises out of the illustration that Native States afford of a possible ultimate solution of the problems presented by British India. If ever an earnest, impartial inquiry were made into the condition of these territories, it might be found that the public welfare would be best promoted by the system adopted by Warren Hastings and endorsed by Munro and by Mountstuart Elphinstone—in a word, *native administration under European impulse and control*. These Native States have received various class titles; sometimes distinguished as protected or allied, sometimes called feudatory, their generic denomination at present is "Internal States," as not lying on the frontiers of the Empire. Alike in point of past history and present dimensions some of them are of considerable importance. For example, Haidrabad, Baroda, Indore, and Gwalior, with, above all, the ancient group of Rajputan; the first of which represents an old Moghul Satrapy, the second three are portions of the famous Mahratta Confederacy and the last a group of Hindu principalities, larger than the kingdom of Prussia and older than any European nation. Then there is Mysore, originally an independent State founded by a scion of the old dynasty of Bijainugger, and still ruled by a Raja

of that house, to whom it was ceded so late as 1881; and there is the fair valley of Cashmere conferred upon a friendly chief by Lord Hardinge after the conquest of the Sikh army in 1846.

All these States exhibit a great and growing population, aggregating nearly 64,000,000 at the last census. They have adopted modern principles in civil administration, and maintain a small, but efficient, military force in each case; while the chiefs know that misfeasance renders them liable to deposition and exile. Now, the chances in favour of this system over one of direct British administration are by no means inconsiderable. Not only is the latter method beset by financial and other difficulties, it is also open to the objections brought by Munro against the much less direct action of Wellesley's "subsidiary system." One of these objections was its "inevitable tendency to bring every Native State under the exclusive dominion of the British Government;" "one effect of such a conquest," so Munro urged with wonderful foresight, "would be that the Indian army would gradually lose its military habits and discipline . . . to feel its own strength, and turn it against its European masters." This was written in the generation before the time of Dalhousie, when the process of time was to make it good. All India then passed, directly or indirectly, under British dominion, and a great part of the Indian army turned its strength against its European masters.

A flaw still more deplorable on moral grounds was pointed out by the same vigorous and experienced observer: wherever British administration came, freedom from the perils of Oriental methods was "purchased by the sacrifice of independence of national character, and of whatever renders a people respectable."

On the other hand, there are the benefits of civilisation, some of which have already received notice here, and have been admitted to have done great good to India. As the late Michael Katkoff generously declared more than ten years ago in the *Moscow Gazette*, the British "have been the saviours of India." But this—as Katkoff showed—was not the result of direct introduction of British methods and institutions so much as of the enforcement of peace and order, which would be equally possible even if there were not one white official in the country outside the presidency towns. Such centres of European industry as Bombay and Calcutta are of the nature of Crown Colonies—like Hong Kong—and may safely be treated as such—as, indeed, they have always been. But, apart from such special cases, we have still to inquire, patiently and anxiously, whether a vast region, containing hundreds of tribes and scores of nations in almost all conceivable states of backwardness, is a fit soil for the transplantation of ideas and practices which have grown up in Western Europe from such different roots and in such varying conditions. Our insular life is quite exceptional, even in

Europe, influenced by Magna Charta, the modified feudalism of the Plantagenets, the semi-reform of religion under the Tudors, the political changes of the seventeenth century, and other movements more or less peculiar to ourselves, and quite unknown—or, at least, quite unfelt—in Oriental countries.

Further, there is this to be weighed. The population of India is about equal to that of the whole of Europe, while the resources of the British State there are comparatively small and inelastic: consequently, measures of administration which appear in these islands to be necessities and matters of course are only possible in such a country if carried out in an inexpensive and most imperfect way. And it may well be that a civilised administration conducted “on the cheap” may lose whatever advantage its exotic nature may have left it, and prove worse in the end than any amount of barbarism that does not offend decency or affect life and property. It is time that an inquiry into the comparative advantages of British and native administration was instituted, more serious and stringent than in the viceroyship of John Laurence, about thirty years ago. For that inquiry was conducted by British officials, who, with the best intentions, were most unlikely to lay before a viceroy who had risen from their own ranks a disparagement of their own procedure. Moreover, in thirty years, and after sundry chiefs had been admonished and chastised, it is not unlikely that native rulers have improved and become more efficient. The restoration of the old dynasty in Mysore is not understood to have caused any mischief, whereas it is certain that in British India health, wealth, and happiness have decreased and come into jeopardy. It is a common-place of political history that backward races are bound to suffer from the impact of foreigners of better organisation and energy who settle among them. How much more likely is such a thing to happen when the newcomers are people “with a mission”! It is not only the attempt to destroy indigenous creeds and substitute the alien belief on religious subjects; that especial form of the danger, perhaps obsolete, vanished with the narrow fanaticism of the famous Punjab school of forty years since. But the idea remains, the preconceived opinion with which almost every earnest Anglo-Indian starts on his career. That is to say, the axiomatic assumption that “the East is played out,” and that Orientalism can produce no useful principles or practice. In John Laurence’s well-known words, “in labouring for the people of India we are to be guided not by their conscience, but by our own.”

Now, of course, in so far as the Indian conscience may have been depraved below the average level of humanity, this is self-evident, and must be admitted by the best of the natives themselves; but perhaps this is not always the case. Thus, when, in 1829, Bentinck called for opinions as to the cruel rite of widow-burning, he expe-

rienced but little opposition. The report, indeed, showed that there was no true antithesis between "our" conscience and that of the people, the question being not one of principle, but of practice; and the rite was abolished without opposition, save from a few cranky Englishmen. The same spirit will be found in all the most successful reforms; but hesitation may still be excused when we come to administrative details, where conscience need not be very scrupulous so long as success can be obtained. The subject is remote and hard to deal with in a popular way; but what has been here advanced is not really very abstruse. The old Company's settlements were neither made for the acquisition of dominion, nor for the propagation of ideas. Greatness was thrust upon the founders, partly by Moghul weakness, partly by French jealousy and ambition. In the language of Adam Smith, they established an empire to acquire customers. Instead of making trade follow the flag, they made the flag follow trade. Then, when the flag was flying on Fort St. George and Fort William, the acknowledged organs of British power stepped in, and the acquisitions of the Company were put under official control. The noble governors sent out with the support of Cabinets soon set aside the authority of what they called "the cheesemongers of Leadenhall Street," and the interior of the country became more and more a British province. When Bentinck met Ranjit of Lahore in 1831, he showed the Sikh chieftain—amongst other things—a map of India; and, on the latter being told the meaning of the red tint, he muttered, "Sub lāl ho-jaiga" (*All will become red*).

The prediction was nearly fulfilled when the process was arrested by the Mutiny. We have still an opportunity of evading what we might perhaps find a damaging inheritance of the old annexing officials. As an illustration of the dangers and difficulties attendant upon introducing exotic ideas into a land like India, the recent results of sanitary reform will be found instructive. We may refer to an article which appeared in the *Pioneer Mail* last year, for we know that the *Pioneer*, apart from its generally high reputation, is not a paper likely to be unfair to the Anglo-Indian authorities. The article is very full and of considerable length; but the outcome may be shortly stated. The case of eight large municipalities being taken, it was shown that, whereas the death-rate prior to the introduction of sanitary works averaged 30·5, it has since risen to 32·8. It is not easy to account for such a result, unless it be that the funds raised are insufficient to ensure complete scientific arrangements, and without such sanitation may do more harm than good. In Bombay, the first commercial city of the Empire, where nearly 600,000 Rx., or conventional Indian £, are spent annually, the Blue-book of 1894 says "the demands upon municipal resources are peculiarly heavy . . . the revenue has grown by 57 per cent. and the expenditure

by 49 per cent. in ten years . . . the incidence per head is . . . 3.90 rupees in 1881 and 6.29 in 1891." And it is in Bombay that the plague raged all through the Jubilee worse than it ever did in Constantinople. The conditions, we must candidly admit, are exceptional, and statistics of such a period ought not to be selected for the purposes of a fair examination. The results, however, of the preceding twelvemonth are to be seen in the Blue-book printed by order of the House of Commons in 1896, and they are certainly suggestive. In the way of improvement, we may observe a small increase of trade at the three principal Indian ports, a decrease in municipal expenditure, a rise in the revenue derived from Customs and from opium—two items not derived from the general contributions of the community—an increase in the number of depositors in the savings banks in spite of a reduction in the rate of interest, and some advances in administrative efficiency. On the other side is to be noticed an increase in the general death-rate, which, in normal conditions, had risen to an average of 34 per thousand, about double that of London. Coupled with subsequent disasters, these figures appear to suggest that an advance in administration is not necessarily a benefit to an Oriental community. By putting down war and abnormal distress you may cause an increase in population, for the comfort of which provision is not possible. The population of India has doubled in two generations. By the last census there were more than 220,000,000 souls in British India, not counting the inhabitants of Native States. By the last published returns the only revenue derivable from universal taxation amounted to a little over 27,000,000 Rs., or conventional Indian £. Thus, a subject of the Indian Government could only be computed to pay about one rupee six annas—say one-third—yearly towards the charges of Imperial administration, if he paid Customs, assessed taxes, &c., which the poor do not, in fact, pay. If we add municipal rating, the fraction is a little larger; but municipal rates are not paid by the rural subjects of the Crown, who are estimated at nearly four-fifths of the population. Adding the State share of rent of land, the assessed taxes, the Excise and the Customs, stamp-duties, and other optional contributions, as also the opium revenue, a precarious item mainly derived from foreigners, the net revenue of the Indian Government amounts to little more than the half of that of the British Islands, while the number of the inhabitants is more than six times as large.

This undoubtedly points to the conclusion that a very elaborate administration—whether or no it be in other ways desirable, or suited to the state of the community—is beyond its power to support adequately. It seems idle to attempt the task of applying Occidental civilisation to a people which can only afford an Oriental revenue; and when to this you add ever-increasing military adventures beyond the North-Western frontier, the limits of possibility are clearly brought

into view. If an unprejudiced and earnest inquiry should ever be made into the affairs of British India, it should by all means include a resolute examination of the condition of the best-administered States, so as to show what are the ideals of rulers' duties and subjects' demands in those provinces not run on British lines.

In an interesting little work lately published at Paris, the accomplished Rector of the University of Brussels has examined the meagre traces of Greek settlements in Upper India, as evidenced by coins, inscriptions, and written records."¹ He comes to the conclusion that the people of India were but little affected by the ideas and practices of the successors of Alexander who ruled in Northern India for about two centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. And the author concludes by saying that if the British dominion were to be eradicated—to which he courteously adds a "*Di avertant*"—the monuments left might be scarcely more important. Were we to challenge this discouraging opinion of an alien, but far from hostile, observer, it would, perhaps, be only safe to suggest the criterion derived from "Native" States, and the results of their Home Rule, influenced—though not coerced—by the suzerain power. We should probably find that—with the exception of town rates, expended where they were raised—there was but little taxation, the expenses of the administration (including a small army and a splendid Court) being met out of the surplus yield of agriculture. But we should find no attempt at many things regarded as duties in England: conservancy, old-fashioned and simple: education, optional and backward; law, irregular, but neither slow nor costly. From which one might, if one pleased, infer that the wearers of shoes were the best judges of the pinch; and that a sixpenny pair of bazaar slippers might suit a Hindu better than a two-guinea pair of Burlington Arcade *bottines*.

Certainly the last financial statements of the Anglo-Indian Government are by no means favourable to the schemes of exotic administration, and the coat is not being cut according to the cloth. The limits of taxation have apparently been reached, and no feasible device is suggested for substantially increasing the State income; the only method of carrying on the existing systems of peace and war—fighting with fanatic highlanders on the border and with famine and plague in the country—is the crude and easily exhausted process of increasing the public debt. Four millions of pounds sterling raised in London, and an attempt to float a similar loan in rupees in India, are the expedients; while the Indian mints continue closed and the silver jewellery which forms the economy of the peasants is turning into tinsel in the owners' hands. The details of finance are a matter for specialists; here we need only remark on the recent depreciation of 3 per cent. paper, as showing the ominous

¹ *Ce que l'Inde doit à la Grèce.* Comte Goblet d'Alviella. Leroux. 1897.

diminution of the Indian Government's credit, while new laws against seditious publications are at the same time called for. Meanwhile, the evidence recorded by the Royal Commission on Indian Expenditure has shown how defective are the checks upon extravagance, especially in the direction of military adventure such as the Chitral war of two years ago.

Nor is it only in the department of finance that the increasing difficulties of the existing system are making friends of India despondent. Deep as was the sympathy felt with Lord Elgin and his subordinates in the efforts that they were making to combat the mingled miseries arising out of the calamities from which our weekly Litanies implore deliverance, it must be remembered that, even before pestilence and famine had commenced their ravages, misery was admitted in the official Blue-books to be the normal condition of a large portion of the native population; while the death-rate was shown to be, on a general average, not less than double the figure prevailing in London.

It is not intended to use any argument in favour of a dense population for a country with such limited resources as India. On the contrary, it is essential to bear constantly in mind that improvements in administration, from the point of view of a European standard, are not necessarily productive of happiness to an Oriental community. By putting down war, crime, and unwholesome practices you may cause a fecundity unsuited to the means of subsistence and hostile to the formation of secondary wants and a desirable scale of living. The population of British India has doubled within the last two generations: but these teeming millions are for the most part dependent on the precarious provision of backward agriculture in a treacherous climate. One obvious evil is that most of these people must live from hand to mouth; and from this ensues the corollary that they cannot pay the increasing expenses of military undertakings and complicated administrative measures. Out of 220,000,000 of British Indian subjects there may be some 20 per cent. who consume luxuries and contribute to the Imperial fisc otherwise than through the excise on the salt which is necessary to their existence. The revenue derived by the Indian Government from the residue of this vast mass of human beings falls on them at the rate of something like sixpence a head yearly, and no one has ever been able to show any safe or certain way of increasing that meagre incidence. Very likely, if the numbers were less, the standard of living might in time rise higher, and other forms of indirect, or even of direct, taxation might come to light.

But such is not now the case, and the bulk of the revenue required by the Government of India is derived from the luxuries of the few rich, the rent of land, assessed taxes, stamps, and Court fees, the contributions of the Provincial Governments, and the pre-

carious item of opium, chiefly paid by foreigners. The total amounts to a little more than half the sum obtained without difficulty in the British Islands, from a people amounting to one-sixth of the number of souls in British India.

In the days of the Company a Parliamentary inquest into Indian affairs, was held every twenty years, at the expiry of the Company's chartered period. If any such *Dokimasia* were now held it, might be a profitable item of the instructions issued to the committee, or commission, that inquiry should at the same time be made into the fiscal policy pursued by the various Native States. Indeed, the entire administration of those States might be found worth examination. An idle comparison is sometimes drawn between the blessings of the *Pax Britannica* and the anarchy which prevailed in many parts of India before it was introduced. The question is not between peace and anarchy : every one can see that kosmos is better than chaos ; all that native reformers are justified in demanding is whether the best is being done that the conditions render possible, and whether any preparation can be initiated for a federation of autonomous provinces, under the general supervision and control of the Empire, but carrying on Eastern administration according to Oriental ideas.

H. G. KEENE.

THE ARMY QUESTION.

DURING the discussion on army questions that has so largely occupied public attention lately there is one subject that hardly seems to have met with the consideration it deserves.

This is the possibility of increasing the attractiveness of service both in the army and the volunteers, and at the same time of strengthening the bonds that unite us to our colonies, by means of offering to men of good character who have served their time special advantages as emigrants.

Such men are precisely the material that many of the colonies would most gladly welcome to their shores. They are the men who have both the muscle and the training that are the qualities most wanted in opening out new countries. Above all, if there is no room for the loafer, the artisan, or the clerk, it is certain that the man who can work steadily with his hands can always earn his food.

In Australia the field of employment is practically unlimited; and, if the chances of war at the moment seem small, no one can tell when European difficulties may arise that would make every chance that the foe would find forces in our most distant possessions possessing at least possible military experience an invaluable additional security.

In Rhodesia the presence of a nucleus of trained men among the farmer class could hardly fail to be useful in case of trouble, whether with white or black enemies, and it is very probable that, should expeditions have to be despatched from home, their cost might be very much reduced if there were a certainty of finding an efficient reserve on the spot on which to draw if the necessity arose.

In Canada an increase in the number of settlers who, if called upon, could use a rifle, is too obvious to need dwelling upon.

It is not as though ancient precedents were wanting. Rome knew the worth of veterans settled on her widespread frontiers; and no part of her policy did more to prolong her empire when the final struggle came than the old soldiers and their descendants in the countries where they had found a home.

In England itself the Statesmen of Northumberland recall the system that helped to guard the borders against Scottish raiders. It

was a wise policy that made the defenders of the north the holders of farms on terms of military service.

It may be objected that as regards Reservists the permission to them to scatter themselves in all parts of the world would destroy the very ground-plan of our short service system. But there is no reason why the extent and places of emigration for soldiers should not be entirely under the control of the War Office. And even if the fact that some of those who would now be within the limits of England would then be found beyond the reach of immediate recall, it is more than probable that the inconvenience would be well balanced by the improved health and strength of those who came to the colours. At present the suspicion is very strong that, as a fighting force, the reserve is to a large extent a paper fiction, and that deprivation and want owing to difficulty in finding work too often destroy the discharged soldier's powers for any practical active service.

It is true that the War Office officials talk as though it was out of the question even to doubt the value of their returns of nominal effectiveness. It is even said that, when the reserves were called out some years ago, the men who assembled were actually found fit for the field.

It would be interesting to know if this statement was based on medical examination or merely on appearance on parade. If the opinion of those who have most to do with charitable work is of any value on the point, the number of men who leave the army only to gradually lose their strength and health under the privations that, in the great majority of cases, fall to their lot must make their future permanent efficiency as members of an active force out of the question.

As regards the volunteers, these difficulties do not apply to the same extent; but it cannot be doubted that, if men felt that in certain contingencies service in the auxiliary forces would be of value in making emigration easier for them, an immense impulse would be given to the popularity of enlistment.

The idea of the employment of men discharged from the army in public offices and large companies as a practical remedy for the present evils is utterly futile. If a man is not employed on account of his working value, to put him into a post because he has been a soldier is only to hide one sore by making one less visible, as well as to rob the community of services it needs. It would be infinitely cheaper all round to give the soldier a little more pension, and let the man who would otherwise have been displaced do the work for which he is probably better suited.

It is not as though the question of the general defence of the Empire is one that can any longer be wisely left to the settlement of England alone. Naturally, hitherto England has occupied the

first place in men's thoughts when military matters have been under discussion; but if the Empire is to continue in safety, the time has come when a broader view must prevail, and our defences must be based more and more on lines that will make the colonies and the mother country one as a home for men of the English race.

J. TYRRELL BAYLEE.

A PLEA FOR THE LIBERTY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

FROM the earliest period the history of the world is the record of a constant struggle between Liberty and Authority. The progress of this struggle may be broadly followed out in the history of our own country from the year 1066. The early Norman kings were despots. Their subjects regarded the Crown as the embodiment of all that was antagonistic to their freedom, and set about securing themselves against displays of tyranny. The barons, having secured the assistance of the people, commenced a movement to obtain from the Crown the recognition of certain rights and immunities which they considered necessary to their welfare. Their success was complete when King John found himself compelled to sign the Magna Charta in 1216. This success prompted them to further endeavours, and in 1265, with the foundation of the House of Commons, the second step was taken—viz., the imposition of a constitutional check upon the actions of the monarch.

It took centuries of struggle to carry this idea to perfection, but by the time of the accession of the Stuarts to the throne of England Parliament had succeeded in forcing the Sovereign to acknowledge the right of the people's voice in the government. Finally, people did not see why the Crown need necessarily be independent, and the opinion gained ground that, if the ruling power were elected by and held place at the will of the nation, the struggle between Authority and Liberty would be ended for good, and tyranny would cease to be; for if the people elected the ruling body or bodies, that meant, in theory, that they ruled themselves, and they would never need protection against their own will. The deposition of James II. and the call of William of Orange were the outcome of this idea, which has been developed since.

But experience has proved that democratic government may, equally with any other form, spell "tyranny." For what does democratic government mean, but that each individual member of the community is ruled by all the rest—that the majority rules, and the majority may desire to oppress a part of their number? The common expression, "the tyranny of the majority," shows that we appreciate

this danger, and that it needs guarding against. When the majority, or society is itself the tyrant, it has means other than political of silencing its opponents. When it issues laws which are wrong, or which oppress the individual, it practises a tyranny much more severely felt than any political oppression, in that this tyranny enters so minutely into the details of private life, and because, though offences against society may not bring such severe punishment as those against the law, there are fewer loopholes of escape.

We need, consequently, protection against prevailing opinion and feeling, against the tendency of society to impose its dictates upon those who disagree with it, as well as against the tyranny of the magistrate. Individuality is in danger of being swamped by social laws. Social tyranny at the present day constitutes a positive danger to the individual, for it tends to make him a slave to custom, a mere machine, a creature who is given a reason which he is not to presume to use, except in so far as it finds him at one with society, whose mandates he disobeys at his peril.

We see this tendency in almost everything. People do everything in crowds; they like or dislike in crowds; and the fact that "the world" does it is considered sufficient justification for any action or line of conduct. The great majority of people dread being deemed as "like nobody," and consider themselves the nearer perfection the nearer they attain to the style of conduct which the world votes proper—that is, being like everybody else. If any one is bold enough to break the fetters with which society would bind him, to think, speak, or act in accordance with his own desires, he is pointed out as a being to be hated and shunned by all so-called right-thinking people.

Now this line of conduct can lead but to one goal—the man ceases to have a mind of his own. Granted that we could all be fitted into the same cast-iron mould, that we could all be made blindly to follow custom, what would be the result? We need only look at the greater part of the world to see. In China we have a good example. There custom is the court of final appeal. Justice is what custom makes it. In fact, China is the perfection of what custom can produce. It was as highly civilised as it is at the present time when our forefathers wandered as savages through the woods of Britain, and the only thing which has prevented its complete decay is the fact that at the outset it was furnished with an excellent code of customs.

Yet it could not have risen to such a height without individuality. There is a point at which all States cease to progress, and either remain stationary or commence the downward path; and that point is the time when individuality is stamped out. China will remain in its present position until fresh blood has been infused into it—

that is, until it is governed by men superior to the commonplace creatures to which social laws are tending to reduce us.

It may be argued that custom is the accumulated knowledge gathered from the experience of centuries. It does not follow that all its conclusions are true. It would be idle to contend that any one should live as if nothing had happened in the world before he came into it, or as though the world had nothing in the way of guidance to give him; but when he knows the conclusions at which the world has arrived, surely we must allow him the right as a human being to differ. Probably, having gone through the same experiences, he would arrive at conclusions entirely different.

Then, again, it may be suggested that a person is not expected to follow custom blindly, but intelligently. What room does that leave for the play of his impulses? The human mind cannot be made to order, and the impulses of the individual may be peculiar to himself. Even though they do differ from those of every other being on the face of the earth, are they therefore wrong? Strong desires are the marks of a strong character, which may be capable of much evil, but certainly capable of great good. It is surely not our duty to stifle every desire which we in our weakness are not able to comprehend, and to reduce such natures to the sorry level which so well contents the majority of mankind. We should not reject the stuff from which heroes are made simply because we do not know how to make them. In such natures let us cultivate the strong feelings with which nature has endowed the man, and educate him to a proper direction of them, and we shall produce a unit valuable in itself and therefore valuable to the community. This strong individualism it is which has made England, and if we wish her to keep her position as foremost in the race of the world, we must encourage it judiciously wherever we find it. Let social tyranny crush individualism to the dust, and what China is England will soon be.

Do we encourage individualism? This is an age of philanthropic movement, the great aim of which is regularity of conduct and the discouragement of excess. The majority of people, having merely moderate tastes and inclinations, apparently back up this philanthropy. The young receive their education pretty much from the same stock; the class distinctions which formerly existed are to a great extent wiped out; improved methods of communication result in personal contact, bringing people of different districts within easy reach of each other. Comparatively speaking, people see the same things, hear the same things, and are led to direct their attention to the same objects. This, and the marks of disapprobation with which any display of eccentricity meets, are liable to bring people to the same platform and to encourage mediocrity. This is levelling

down, rather than levelling up; it goes in the direction of making custom supreme.

Greater liberty should be given to the individual. Liberty of thought and speech have, after a prolonged struggle, been conceded, although there may be found people who, on their own pet failings, even yet refuse to allow the right unreservedly. Liberty of speech is justified on three grounds: first, if the opinion be true, the world reaps the benefit to be derived from that truth; secondly, if the opinion be false, truth is the more strengthened by contest with it; and lastly, if it be partly true and partly false, our opinions, if they do not entirely lose their weakness, at any rate gain the corrections which would have greatly improved them. The commencement of the struggle was due to religion, and the man who brought the long fight to a close and finally settled the matter was Charles Bradlaugh.

But that liberty allowed to speech is not granted to the same extent to liberty of action, although the latter may be claimed almost on the same grounds. Diversity is not an evil, but a good, so long as mankind are incapable of recognising all sides of the truth. This applies to action as to speech. Different experiments of living must be made, and the worth of the different modes compared, before the best can be found. And how is this to be done unless, as far as possible, liberty of action is allowed? Of course we recognise the fact that a man owes certain duties to society at large, and it is only right that those duties should be exacted of him. He cannot expect to reap the benefit to be derived from living in a community without giving as far as possible his services to the community in return.

But there are things for which the individual is not responsible to any one except himself. The point is, where is the line to be drawn? Here: first, the individual is not accountable to society for his actions, in so far as these concern the interests of no person but himself. His actions may in our opinion be foolish, or even wrong; but if the only harm resulting therefrom descends on the person's own head, society may advise, persuade, or avoid him, but is certainly not justified in actively interfering with him. Secondly, for such actions as are prejudicial to the interests of others the individual is accountable, and may be subjected either to social or legal punishment if society is of opinion that one or the other is necessary for its protection.

We do not preach a doctrine of selfish indifference, which pretends that no person should interest himself in the good of others, that it matters not what others make of themselves so long as we are right. There is too little, rather than too much, disinterestedness in the world. We, as brothers, owe each other advice and encouragement. What we object to is using compulsion to bring about what is supposed to be a reformation in the self-regarding actions of another.

By all means let us dissuade him, if possible, from actions which we consider wrong; but let us remember that each individual is the best judge of his own affairs, and that we have no right to say that he shall not do with his own life, for his own benefit, what he chooses. We must allow him to be the final judge and take the consequences. If a person is guilty of conduct of which we disapprove, we are free not only to entertain an unfavourable opinion of him, but also to act upon that opinion in the exercise of our own individuality, but not to the suppression of his. We may warn others against him, while we shun his society ourselves, and in this way make him feel that we consider him our inferior. But such inconveniences as these are the only ones to which a person should be subjected for that portion of his conduct which concerns only himself.

It may be advanced that any part of the conduct of a member of society cannot be a matter of indifference to the other members, that a person may be injurious by his example, that society ought not to abandon to their own guidance those who are plainly unfit for it. Quite so. But we must not step too far. Society must give as well as take; for, to quote Mill, "with regard to the merely contingent or, it may be called, constructive injury which a person causes to society by conduct which neither violates any specific duty to the public nor occasions perceptible hurt to any assignable individual except himself, the inconvenience is one which society can afford to bear for the sake of the greater good of human freedom."

Concerning people who are incapable of looking after themselves, on whom does the fault lie if not on society? It has had the training of them from their youth up, and if it has shown itself unable to produce a rational being, the punishment ought, in all reason, to fall on itself. It is a miserable confession for society to make, surely; and then, to redeem its failures, it would find a remedy in compelling every individual to abject submission to its will! And we know that any endeavour to coerce the individual into prudence, or temperance, will, if there be a spark of manhood in him, only provoke rebellion. A glance at the history of Charles II. shows us quite plainly what good results accrue from trying to compel people to be good.

But the chief reason why society should not interfere in private concerns is that when it does meddle it stands a greater chance of being wrong than right; for, to the majority, right is what satisfies them, and any conduct with which they disagree is wrong—that is to say, they look at it from their own point of view, and not from that of the individual concerned. In many cases the right or wrong of any conduct is not considered, so much as the crime of thinking or acting in opposition to social laws.

The conclusion to which we come, then, is that greater liberty should be allowed to the individual, and that we should not pay such blind regard to what "the world" tells us to be right or wrong, but that we should decide every question on its own merits, and never be afraid to stand by our opinions once they are formed. If we in this way foster individuality, we shall at least have done something to leave the world better than we found it.

J. PARRINGTON POOLE.

STEIN'S PLACE IN HISTORY.

EVEN in the age of Frederick a citizen of the Prussian State could dream of a golden era when the war-drum might be heard no longer and all the nations of the world at length dwell together in unity. But the century which is hurrying to its grave has been, perhaps, more warlike and less humane in its dominant ideals than the last, and no speedy fulfilment seems likely to await the yearnings of the sage of Königsberg. Nevertheless its struggles have been less dynastic and more markedly national. Such a change is, indeed, only a part of the great social transformation which dates from the French upheaval and the influence of steam and electricity in breaking down paltry barriers and old-world shapes of prejudice. No European reformer bridges over the gulf between the two ages and their special problems better than the imperial knight who saved the Prussian State from overwhelming dangers and trials—Heinrich Friedrich Karl Freiherr vom Stein.

The future soul and champion of the rising against Napoleon was born at Nassau in an old hill-side castle not far from the cradle of the stubborn House of Orange on the 26th of October, 1757. He always himself believed that the stately associations of his childhood and old-German piety of his parents formed the basis of that earnestness and strength which caused him to stand out so markedly in manhood from the common herd of dull bureaucrats and courtiers. Although he was a Christian and a knight, the service of the unbeliever Frederick attracted him more than the ancient House of Hapsburg when his "Lehrjahre" in Göttingen were over. In 1780 he went up to Berlin to take a subordinate post in the Mining Department and engage in travel and study for his official work. It is pleasing to note that English history and politics, for which he had conceived a fondness in his old home, remained his favourite pastime in leisure hours throughout his eventful career. It may be even said that his mind was more English than German in spite of his glowing patriotism, and no German writer (except, indeed, Goethe in later years) seems to have made a deep and lasting impression upon him. He quotes Schiller's "Song of the Bell," at any rate once in his life, but vague and feverish idealism was not exactly to his taste, and the current speculative systems seemed to

him somewhat meaningless. The word "metapolitician" was his favourite term of contempt (not altogether unjust) for a somewhat typical and undying class of his countrymen.

His intellect and force of character soon made him mount. Before the great king had gone to his long home he had become an inspector in Westphalia—a province which the present monarch has called the heart of the Fatherland along with the Rhine districts—and was sent on a mission to Mainz to persuade the spiritual Elector to join a Prussian league against Joseph II. Although he succeeded in his task, he could not repress a dislike for the dubious methods of diplomacy, which clung to him all his life. Not long after he made a tour of nine months in England, and returned to his own country in August 1787 as director of roads and navigation.

This period of his life in the province of Westphalia has caused him to be compared to Turgot. It is curious, but at the same time significant, that he should have refused two embassies (at The Hague and St. Petersburg) for the sake of this peaceful employment. Yet he was probably happier among Dutch-like canals and prosaic new roads than he would have been in the court of the great Catharine while the Turkish War was raging and Suvaroff was winning his laurels. Unlike most men of his age, he laid great stress on purity of life, and could not have felt at home in the company of handsome favourites and guardsmen of the Empress.

While he was enjoying the blessedness of toilsome solitude on the banks of the Ruhr the great storm came from which our present epoch of history may be supposed to date. But his temper was too sane to indulge in the fierce diatribe of Burke or the generous enthusiasm of Fox. Even the first campaign and the battle of Valmy find little mention in his journal, although he was himself engaged in supplying the Prussians with food. He married in the same year in which the French king met his death on the scaffold.

Meanwhile a change had come over the spirit of the Prussian monarchy. With all his unscrupulous wars and frightful private vice, the victor of Rossbach had been a splendid and exemplary ruler. No monarch in the world is, even nowadays, more cherished in the memory of the common people by the help of fond anecdotes. But his nephew, Frederick William II., was a vessel of inferior clay who combined sensuality and sentiment (especially religious mysticism) in a way that is far from uncommon. The ill-starred Polish heritage was soon destined to confirm (perhaps more eloquently than most modern biologists) the solemn *τριγύρων μῦθος* that a divine resentment visits the children of those that have sinned against divine law. The plunder of Polish peasants corrupted the favourites of the king (unworthy as they were by nature), and the old Spartan spirit was beginning to be undermined by the spread of French manners. In 1797 he left to his son and successor a stagnant army,

an impoverished exchequer, and a kingdom declining in prestige among the nations of Europe.

Very different estimates have been formed of Frederick William the Third. To foreigners he has often seemed indecisive and flabby, but Treitschke, as a court-historian, makes a fair case in his favour. It cannot be doubted that a curse rested on him from the cradle as the heir to an old system that had become impossible, and only the reforms of Stein saved his throne from tottering, just as Bismarck saved his second son William in a later age.

The peace of Campo Formio in the year of the new king's accession was denounced by Stein as "black and complete treachery." In 1804 he exchanged the post of President of the Westphalian Chambers for that of Chief Minister of Trade, and left Münster for Berlin. The great national bank had fallen into the hands of Jews, whose covetousness and lax principles aroused his indignation. One of the most fraudulent saved himself by running away to Vienna and becoming a Roman Catholic when his guilt had been found out. Stein introduced reforms and gave the chief management to Barthold Niebuhr, of Copenhagen, who afterwards became famous for his severe handling of legend and revision of Roman annals.

The finances of the Prussian State had long lagged behind modern Western notions. Stein was the first to import the doctrines of Adam Smith and French economists, and employ them beyond the Elbe. Obsolete customs were removed, and a sort of internal free-trade set up. In order to meet the increased military expenditure that was needful for a war with France he resorted to paper money as a lesser evil than a debasement of the coinage (of which even the great Frederick had been guilty) or reliance on foreign subsidies.

But Prussia was soon to be punished for the neutrality and vacillation of the king. Napoleon (in whom Hegel saw an appearance of the World-Soul) suddenly made war. The gallant old Blücher expressed a fervent wish in his breezy style that Stein were Foreign Minister and the incapable Von Hagen were in hell! Perhaps, if that desire had been fulfilled, England or Austria might have been willing to send help in time—a course from which they were deterred by the suspicion of French sympathies at the Court of Berlin—and have kept the invader back. As everybody knows, the old Prussian system melted away like snow on the fields of Jena and Auerstedt, and "the Corsican parvenu" entered Berlin in triumph. Besides bad generalship, some part of the Prussian disaster may be ascribed to the fact that the muskets with which they were supplied were the worst in Europe in the judgment of Scharnhorst.

Something of the same fate now fell to Prussia as had fallen to Poland before her. Besides being forced to surrender a good half of her territory to Russia, Saxony, and Westphalia, a solemn promise was extorted that her whole standing army should not exceed 42,000

men. The task of regeneration and recovery that lay before soldiers and statesmen was, perhaps, one of the hardest that any brave men had ever been asked to face.

The glory of the great triumph belongs to several men, of whom Stein was the foremost. Hardenburg, who once fell deeply in love with Stein's sister, excelled him in knowledge of the world and diplomatic craftiness, but lacked his seriousness and depth. Scharnhorst reformed the army and abolished the brutalities of flogging, which had made the old system odious to the thoughtful middle-class. It could not be doubted that the only method of escaping Napoleon's chains was to be sought in the extension of popular liberties and useful guidance of enthusiasm, such as lay dormant in countless way-sides and homesteads. Luther had once succeeded in stirring his countrymen for an idea, and the chief problem of the present was to turn them away from "metaphysical cobwebs"—the phrase is of Stein's coinage—to patriotic and useful interests. The success of the Spanish insurrection and the brilliant deeds of well-fed British troops filled downcast patriots with hope. The famous words "England has saved herself by her courage, she will save Europe by her example"—applied in the first instance to the great naval engagements which Treitschke and his school of Chauvinists somewhat fatuously overlook—were destined before long to receive strange fulfilment.

No reform of Stein is better known to the great mass of the people than the abolition of serfdom—sometimes called the Prussian Habeas Corpus Act—which he caused the king to sign five days after he had risen to the head of affairs. The king, who has been well termed "the most respectable and ordinary" of the great Hohenzollern house, suspected Stein's genius and intellect much in the same way as "Farmer George" spoke of Pitt's "protruding upper lip." But he had learnt lessons in adversity and could not well do without him. Niebuhr's curious citation of the solemn words, "Tu es Petrus, et super hanc petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam," to the baron whose name was "rock," expressed a widespread feeling. The fair Queen Louise seems to have been more hopeful than her husband as regards the future of her country, but died in the midst of sorrow.

The great emancipating edict which swept away the old conditions of feudalism has been compared to the decree issued by the unhappy Czar Alexander II. under the influence of Turgenev's *Memoirs of a Russian Sportsman*. Like all great reforms, it was opposed by a fraction of selfish possessors, some of whom found it even more shocking than three French victories. Besides transforming Prussian peasants (that is to say, the backbone of the Prussian army) from slaves into free men, the edict removed restrictions on the sale of land, and enabled noblemen to engage in common civic pursuits.

Two other results connected with Stein's ministry must be mentioned—the reform of municipal affairs and the establishment of the University of Berlin. If others (not to mention the much-misquoted *Zeit-Geist*) can claim a large share in the liberation of the serfs, the credit of restoring to townships their long-lost privileges of self-government belongs to Stein alone. Treitschke calls the Municipal Act of November 19, 1808, “an altogether creative achievement, the free work of his genius”; and Dahlmann asserts that “he became in a deeper sense than King Henry, who could but build fortresses, the town-builder of Germany.” It is curious to note that the problem whether a large or a small town was best suited for a seat of learning engaged his honest attention. In the end he thought the possible good effect of culture on the seat of government outweighed the disadvantage of moral temptations to the young in a gay capital, and gave his warm support to Wilhelm von Humboldt's scheme. It was not, however, carried into effect till after his unforeseen retirement.

The importance of Stein's innovations cannot be easily overrated. Without such an increase of self-consciousness and strength neither town nor country would have been so willing to rise against the foreign despotism. Yet it cannot be wondered that the great despot himself viewed such attempts to rouse the national spirit with displeasure. The contents of an unguarded letter, which fell into French hands, gave Napoleon an excuse for insisting on Stein's banishment and confiscating his goods. The rising strategist, Gneisenau (whom Blucher once embraced in a drunken fit at table by way of answering the riddle how a man might kiss his brains), wrote to the fallen Minister to comfort him, with the assurance that he was a part of history. As he fled across the snows of the Riesen Gebirge on a cold winter night to seek shelter in Austria, he is said to have found comfort in one of Schleiermacher's sermons on the emptiness of all save the fear of God.

Many old-fashioned Prussians (including General Yorck) were glad at the departure of a man who seemed to be reforming his country too much on English lines; but the Austrian Emperor was only too pleased to grant him an asylum in his State. In the war of 1809, which ended in the disaster of Wagram, he played no part, although his sympathies embraced the whole German Fatherland and were not restricted to Prussia. The mistake of England in wasting troops on the coast of Holland and the phlegma of North Germans filled him with disappointment; the heroism of the Tyrolese peasants looked more hopeful and encouraging. But the conclusion of peace with France, the sacrifice of Marie Louise and the advent of the cynical Metternich to power ushered in a period of frivolity and rottenness in Austria.

After passing a few obscure years chiefly at Prague, where he

found some consolation for the evils of the age in studying history and teaching it to his daughter, Henrietta, a formal entreaty of the Czar carried him suddenly to St. Petersburg in 1812. For Napoleon was on his eastward march with the greatest army the world had ever seen since the days of Xerxes, and no statesman seemed more capable of guiding Russian enthusiasm than the clear-headed German exile. To quote the words of Treitschke :

"As the ivy clings to the oak so did Alexander cling to the iron courage of Stein. . . . The news of the approach of the heathen to the holy city of Moscow set the whole nation in uproar, and when dormant public opinion once wakes under a despotism it wakes with irresistible power. Alexander knew quite well he could not give way to the French without losing his throne."

This period is certainly the most thrilling and poetical in Stein's career. The letter of the Czar reached him on May 19, eight days after he set out for Wilna, the headquarters of the army of resistance. On June 28 he left that town along with the Russians, and followed the monarch to Moscow. The spectacle of masses worshipping with deep and mystic piety in the great churches, the devotion of all classes to the sacred person of the Sovereign—in short, the mighty fact that Church and State were one—impressed him even more than the beauty of the buildings and quaint old shops and streets of which but few planks and stones were to be left standing within a few months. On July 31 the Czar hurried away to St. Petersburg, and his German adviser came on two days after, by his request. The fact that Alexander was more or less of a Liberal, as Czars go, in spite of the uncertain Slav susceptibility that marred the manliness of his nature, and sometimes sapped his will, made it easy for Stein to join hands with him and keep his conscience clear. But he wisely refused to meddle with Russian domestic questions, and gave up all his zeal and energy to the problem of coping with Napoleon. For he was well aware that the freedom of the continent of Europe, and specially German freedom, was staked on the issue of the war.

Before he had been many months in the northern Russian capital another exile joined him, who was afterwards to become his Boswell. For the writer of patriotic songs is no less dangerous in the eyes of an enemy than the statesman who makes good laws, and Napoleon was, perhaps, wise, from his own point of view, to proscribe an unquiet professor in Greifswald named Ernst Moritz Arndt. Although he was not familiar with the details of statecraft, and retained through life the rough sea-beaten simplicity of his island-home of Rügen, the help that he gave was invaluable. Above all, he was a robust believer in an age of moral laxity and unhistoric contempt of high and holy things. His popular and pious writings, exempt from

bigotry and cant, appealed to the ancient religiosity and dormant patriotism of his countrymen. His father had been a farmer of Swedish extraction, and he himself was born a subject of the King of Sweden, but became in the long run more German than the Germans. His stanzas that speak of "sea-gulls trailing in the Baltic and vine-grapes ripening on the Rhine" are still a household word, although his political writings have been largely forgotten.

The horrors of the winter campaign still feed the imagination of fashionable painters and novelists. On September 7 the hard-won victory of Borodino laid the sacred old capital at the mercy of the invader. Only eight days after Napoleon was inside the Kremlin, and the whole city in flames. In spite of the general despair, and although the Czar's hair turned grey in a night at the result of the news, Stein's habitual firmness never wavered in the least. The witness of Arndt may be cited: "Never have I seen him more fresh and vigorous than in these critical weeks. We and others of our party drank to Old England and the good fortune of Russia and Germany, to Wellington and his Spanish struggle; but the flames of Moscow frightened the cowardly and those of little faith." The Czar turned to the Bible, which he had not read for years, at the advice of a friend, and imbibed a new and soul-subduing mysticism of strange, and partly of baneful, influence on the world in the years that were to come. Like the dead queen of Prussia, he might have entered in his diary the famous lines of Goethe as no less appropriate to himself:

"Wer nie sein Brod mit Thränen ass,
Wer nie die Kummervollen Nächte
Auf seinen Bette weinend sass,
Der Kennt euch nicht, ihr himmlischen Mächte!"

But a more terrible judgment (wherein some beheld the writing of an angel's hand) broke over Napoleon. After losing five precious weeks in negotiations for peace (which the energy of Stein, working on an impressionable Sovereign, served largely to frustrate), he started on his long retreat. A Russian army that lay south of Moscow prevented him from taking a route where supplies might have been found, and forced him to trace his steps backwards by the old road, where villages and grass had been consumed. Thanks to the endless stretches of snow and the savage hordes of Cossacks, hardly 30,000 escaped, over the frontier, as the world knows, but many writers forget that even the Russian army was scarcely less reduced.

A chance to liberate Germany had at length come. By the resolute advice of Stein the Czar made up his mind, in spite of discordant voices, to carry on the war beyond his own frontier, and drive the Corsican back to the place from which he came. General Yorck, who had been compelled against his will to lead the Prussian contingent that followed the French to Russia, on hearing that the

grand army had practically ceased to exist, signed his famous convention with the icy despot. His own 18,000 troops were pledged to occupy the land between Memel and Tilsit and allow the Russian forces a free passage to Königsberg. The Czar, on the other hand, promised not to lay down his arms until he had obtained for Prussia such a restitution of territory as to enable her once more to hold a place among the great Powers. As the Russian army was worn by fatigue and sickness, and no longer amounted to more than 40,000, the alliance, or even the neutrality, of the well-preserved Prussian forces (which had been left behind in the Baltic provinces to the left of the grand army, and suddenly received orders to cover its retreat) was of immense value to him at that critical hour. But Yorck's prompt action, without the authority of the king, exposed his own person to great danger, in spite of the approval of his soldiers. Failure would have made his conduct as distasteful to Frederick William III. as the rash landing of the Greeks in the island of Crete appeared to his great-grandson a few months ago; but the die was now cast, and no disavowal would be easy.

Stein left St. Petersburg on January 5, 1813, accompanied only by Arndt and a few servants and soldiers, in the dark winter evening, while all the bells of the churches pealed loudly for prayer. To quote the words of his companion :

"Our journey lay over icy fields and frozen swamps varied by pine and beech wood, where one only beheld wretched lonely skeletons of huts deprived of roofs and windows by the fugitives of the army. . . . Our sledges rolled here and there over dead bodies; right and left lay the relics of men and horses and the ruins of cannon; separate waggons and cars lay deserted and frozen into the snow; ravens hovered and shrieked, and wolves howled an awful concert over them. How hideous were the nights as the moon and stars looked down on the cold and wretched anguish!"

At Plescow, on the Lake of Peipus, Count Chasot, the commander of the German legion, raised to a large extent by the efforts of Stein from exiles and prisoners, lay dying of fever. The baron in the name of the Fatherland gave him a last embrace, and went on his way to Königsberg with authority from the Czar to turn the forces of the province against the French Emperor. Without consulting the Court of Berlin, of which he had no high opinion, he summoned the East Prussian Estates to assemble and take measures for the creation of an army. General Yorck appealed to the patriotism of all present by a sudden and sensational appearance at Stein's request. His terse concluding words, "The field of battle must decide," were the prologue to the new drama.

The details of the war of 1813 are too well known to require citing afresh. Yet without Stein's moral courage and resolve in the first instance Blücher and Gneisenau could hardly have had a chance of winning their deathless laurels. The nickname "Emperor of

Germany" (which some officers dreamed of turning into a reality) bore witness to the feeling with which his countrymen regarded him. A few months before the battle of Leipsic he wrote to W. von Humboldt the following curious letter :

"Wellington's brilliant victory fills us with joy; we have here a courier according to whom Joseph and Jourdain are beaten, and their armies utterly destroyed. . . . Long live the Marquis of Wellington! Pray buy A. W. Schlegel on *Dramatic Art and Literature*, Vienna, 1809, and give to Henrietta [his daughter] to form her taste."

It seems to have been his desire to divide his German Fatherland—for he knew no other—into two great federal States under Austria and Prussia. But that great question was not to be finally settled till half a century later under the guidance of a genius, on the whole more brilliant, but far less scrupulous than his own. The man who kept the portrait of Maria Theresa as well as Frederick in his study would hardly have given his consent to the fratricidal war of 1866 or favoured the exclusion of some ten million Austrian Germans from a State which actually contains in its area no small percentage of Slavs.

Napoleon's army did not amount to more than half the forces of Russians, Prussians, Austrians, and Swedes that were leagued against him. It is not perhaps so surprising as is often suggested that the allies should have overcome him by force of numbers and got to Paris at last.

Stein arrived on April 9, ten days after the Czar and the Prussian king, to find old Blücher amusing himself with cards in a fashionable café. Gneisenau was delighted to see him again and found him as bright as ever in spite of a certain irritability which his wanderings had increased. It was pretty clear who had caused the Russian armies to cross over the Memel, and deserved the chief credit next to the generals and soldiers. Without the help of Russia the issue might have been far different, although Napoleon himself always spoke of England as his worst and mightiest foe.

After the battle of Leipsic the allied Sovereigns made Stein chief administrator of the hostile German provinces now held by their armies. He appeared at the Congress of Vienna by order of the Czar and urged the absorption of Saxony by Prussia, as a punishment for her French sympathies in the interest of other Germans. The countless small princes were little to his taste (although they had done something for letters and art) and only seemed to him to keep a capable people back. But his Pan-Germanic aims did not quite please the representatives of other Powers, and had to fall through. The Tory English statesmen believed too much in Metternich (to the sorrow of Europe in the following age), yet Wellington esteemed Stein and was not deaf to his suggestions.

Stein hated Metternich as heroes are apt to hate cynics—not

because he was duped of the wine-estate of Johannisberg, which had been promised him first as a reward for his labours.

"What a contrast," writes Dr. Neubauer, "there was between the two men! Stein was animated with the idea of calling the nations of Europe to a struggle for freedom; Metternich was a mistrustful foe of every popular movement. The one saw in the State a moral organism that served to raise and educate its citizens; the other viewed it simply as a mechanical end in itself, devoid of all soul and kept up by artifice and crafty calculation."

Yet it must be said in Metternich's favour that he did not return Stein's hatred, but explained it away as a part of his peculiar nature on reading his letters a year after his death. "No one," he wrote, "honoured more than I the Baron's distinguished gifts both of mind and heart." Such an admission is remarkable from the pen of a rival with whom he had nothing in common. For Metternich has been well termed "a worldling of the eighteenth century," and could not bear enthusiasm any more than Talleyrand. It was left to his third wife to detect a hidden resemblance (of which the world knew nothing) between her dear Clemens and the Apostle Paul.

The eternal Polish question had somehow to be faced. The crafty scheme of Alexander (professing at length to atone for the dark deed of Catharine) spoke of a union of the fragments under himself as king, and a specious revival of the old parliamentary system. Stein did not wish to see him thus acquire a frontier "menacing to Prussia and Austria," and thought the Poles unfit to govern themselves in the absence of any kind of sober middle-class. He could not help feeling that they were themselves largely to blame for their sad fate, and quoted the words of their great sixteenth-century sovereign that they knew neither laws nor government, and survived merely by chance. But the Czar got what he wanted, and Prussia was well rid of a troublesome heritage. A comparison of maps at the beginning of 1806 with those that came out after the end of the war will show how much she renounced of her old theft on the banks of the Vistula. Songs are still sung by Germans in praise of Polish beauties, and tears are sometimes shed over the grave of a people that is not risen from the dead, and yet cannot moulder away gently in the earth.

The return of Napoleon from Elba put a stop to the disputes of the Congress, and united all once more against the common enemy. Just four days after the Battle of Waterloo Stein received the following notable letter from Blücher:

"I hope, my honoured friend, you are satisfied with me. In three days I have fought two bloody battles and five sharp engagements and invested three fortresses besides. . . . Napoleon's sword, hat, and cloak are in my hands. Farewell; I wish it were at an end, I am longing for rest! Make Alexander give me a little estate near Birnbaum; then we shall be near neighbours; I should like to spend my last days quietly in the country."

The Peace of Paris failed to give him entire satisfaction. He thought France was still left dangerously strong, and wished to see Strasburg given back to Germany for purposes of defence. But England and Austria were against the proposal, and the Czar wanted to gain the support of France for his Eastern policy. Lord Liverpool feared that too large a cession of territory would weaken the power of the Bourbons and keep the people in a state of effervescence and danger to all their neighbours.

Stein's last years were spent in repose like the stubborn knight of the castle in Goethe's imperishable lines. A great wave of reaction came over German politics, and the somewhat barren luxury of orders and crosses was all that he could expect in the days of the Holy Alliance. But the crude liberalism of theorists was hardly less repulsive to him than selfish and stubborn adhesion to the dead past. His only public appearance after 1815 was in the capacity of President of the Westphalian Estates. A talkative innkeeper, who had been chosen a member, came to ask his advice, but was only told by him to sit still and listen to the wisdom of others.

Like many other statesmen since the beginning of governments, he learnt the truth of the Psalmist's solemn counsel to such as put their trust in princes and the children of men. But he did not complain of his lot or unburden his soul to journalists; he preferred to spend his time in teaching his daughter history and looking after his estates. The famous "*Monumenta Germanica*" were started under his patronage. In a letter to his friend Arndt (who settled in Bonn as a professor, not far out of reach) he expressed a strong desire to purchase the life and letters of Admiral Collingwood.

Arndt has certainly drawn a most delightful picture of Stein's old age. One morning, as he strolled into Cologne Cathedral in the summer of 1815, whom should he find but Goethe in the company of the baron. The "old-master" of letters was then close on seventy, and the great statesman forgave him for being a world-patriot just as he was a world-poet. "Hush, children, hush; don't mention politics. We cannot praise Goethe there; but think how great he is," was his simple comment. Stein had found Goethe renewing the golden memories of his poetic youth, and persuaded him to rest a night in his mansion at Nassau and take a carriage-drive with him down the castled Rhine to the city of the three kings. The two greatest Germans of the period—nor would it be easy to find their superiors in any age—treated each other with a kind of mutual and ennobling reverence which struck Arndt particularly as he sat at tea with them in the inn. Arndt was a frequent guest in Stein's two country-seats. The newly acquired residence in Westphalia seemed to please the baron better than his old home, partly on account of the people, whose strong common-sense was so congenial to his taste. The Germans on the other side of the Elbe and those beyond the

Oder, with their admixture of Slav blood and rougher way of living, won his sympathies less. He even went so far as to regret that the capital was at Berlin, and thought the sandy flats tended to materialise the people: of the Prussian Junker class his opinion was by no means flattering. In no other country are the physical and psychical contrasts between North and South and between East and West so great as in Germany. It must not be forgotten that Stein was a warm-blooded Rhenish Frank, to use the appropriate label.

One day Stein had been speaking of the duties and privileges of high life, and found fault with Arndt for his low opinion of nobles. But when the poet protested that he only meant to criticise those in his old home, he received this reply:

"Oh, you mean those in Mecklenburg, and further Pomerania, and in the sand-denes of Brandenburg, who can only possess disastrous and backward views; too much Polish and Russian air blows over there. But that is no imperial and knightly, but hardly a half-German nobility—a sort of *genus hybridum*, in which a piece of long-extinct antediluvian animal subsists. But I don't allow the application of such criticism to us, the old imperial nobility as we are called; here on the Rhine and in Westphalia the peasants have not suffered such a race to grow up as yonder."

A Catholic pastor, Fey, was another welcome visitor. Yet some writers have erred in supposing that Stein himself had any such spiritual leanings towards the older faith as the romantic writers of the day. His whole nature was positive and not in the least mystical; but he felt the value of religion as a social force, and wished to be on friendly terms with a Church that appeals to the poor more than colder systems. The following words are enough to attest his personal sentiments.

"Thank God, Luther has made the path and entrance to heaven somewhat shorter for us: for he has abolished the numerous court-chamberlains, masters of ceremonies, and doorkeepers of the heavenly palace. You know I always prefer the short route although it may be steep and dangerous." Nor was he forgetful of the fact that Protestants had usually beaten Catholics on the field of battle and shown a superior aptness for solving political problems.

Unlike the children of the Aufklärung, Stein was a positive Christian in the strict sense of the term. Where poets and philosophers simply hoped and wondered his attitude was different. Instead of setting the great religions of the world more or less on a level, and making conduct the sole claim to the precious ring, Stein clung firmly to the central mystery of redemption and the assurance that Christ rose on the third day from the dead. Although he was entirely free from sectarian narrowness and bitterness (whether towards Catholics or Calvinists), he spoke of sceptics with dislike, and thought virtue and happiness only could be obtained by simple faith in the Man-God. The beauty of the valley of the Lahn in the

golden sunshine set him in his old age dreaming of the fadeless splendours of the land where his wife had gone before him. The impressive prayer of the historian Ranke (written in his eightieth year) would have summed up his confession in a nutshell :

“ Wer ist die Kraft
 Die Leben in mir schafft ?
 Wer giebt Erkenntniss
 Und Verständniss ?
 Wer bewahrt die Seele
 Dass sie nicht fehle ?
 Allgewaltiger
 Einer und Dreifaltiger,
 Du hast mich aus dem Nichts gerufen,
 Hier knie ich vor deines Thrones Stufen.”

Stein's conception of the infinite underlay his whole work in the world. The frivolities of the salon and loose conduct of men like his colleague Hardenberg repelled him, simply because his own views of life were as earnest as those of Milton, who felt unable to escape the eye of “ the great Taskmaster,” in the midst of vice around him, however easily he might be forgiven by his fellow-men. His was, indeed, the faith which was able to remove mountains, and, even in day of trial, when evil seemed to have triumphed, took refuge in the thought, “ Es giebt ein richtendes Gewissen und eine strafende Gottheit.”

What, then, is his place in European history ? With deep roots in all that was grand and inspiring in the past, to have bridged over the gulf between two dissimilar centuries. Besides being the first to call forth dormant popular forces and apply Western ideas to a somewhat feudal state, he was likewise the father of modern political thinking by his intense belief in nationality. Nor, if statesmen are to be measured by the obstacles they overcame as well as the splendour of the results, can any single German—not even Bismarck—be placed conspicuously above him.

Many years passed before a statue was erected to him in the Leipziger Strasse in Berlin. The eyes and features, with their suggestion of inward self-reproach and tremulous appeal to heaven, bear a certain resemblance to those of Mr. Gladstone. Few men of equal importance remain less known to the common public ; but historians will burn incense at his shrine as long as worthy deeds may serve to ennoble life and point to something higher than the worship of wealth or force.

The cause of Greek freedom aroused his warm sympathy a year before his death. He was not in the least biassed by any old-world sentiment, but rather by inborn hatred of cruel Turkish despotism and belief in human progress. In one of his last letters he declares his simple trust that the Greek cause would prevail, in spite of

enormous odds, because the Author of the Universe would surely be on their side. He entered into correspondence with Leopold (afterwards King of the Belgians), and felt sorry at his refusal to wear the new-made crown, which was to have fallen to Byron, and settled at last on the head of a younger Bavarian prince.

The news of the victory of Navarino gave him real pleasure, in spite of the jealousy of the Powers. What, it may be asked, would he have said to the base ingratitude of those who preach the destruction of British supremacy at sea as a lofty German aim, unmindful of the certain fact that only that sea-power and only our financial support saved Germans from vassalage and (even on Hadowberg's avowal) made the heroic war of liberation possible? Like Dr. Dollinger, he believed in the moral value of England as a world-power, and would not have wished to see much of her importance fade.

He passed away peacefully, at Cappenberg, on June 29, 1831, amid the red earth that he had loved so deeply. His last thoughts were given to the future of his Church and country, and no anxious forebodings on his own behalf disturbed his spiritual repose, such as are said to have troubled the last hours of Cromwell. The singer of the German Fatherland followed his body to the grave, for he honoured him with the same affection as Melancthon felt for Luther. Perhaps the resemblance that he saw between his dead master and the great rebel against authority in sacred matters may appear fanciful to some. For, in spite of his moral zeal and hatred of injustice and wrong, Stein's whole nature was more conservative than Luther's. He was scrupulous rather than violent, intellectual rather than imaginative, perhaps too austere to impress popular fancy and remain a household word, like "Brother Martin" or old Fritz. Humour could not be called one of his chief traits, although he was playful at times and by no means devoid of primary human sympathies.

His critics found him irritable and somewhat intolerant of the sin against which the gods are said to struggle in vain. It would be hard to point to a statesman who swerved less from his ideal, or strove more constantly to make his brethren happier and better. A Russian exile in Paris was known, in 1870, to forbid his half-French sons from fighting against Germany, on the ground that Stein had been a German. To us he is interesting because he took so much from our experience in the questions that he faced, and helped us to bind in chains a world-historical foe.

MAURICE TODHUNTER.

R. L. STEVENSON :

CHARACTERISTICS.

WE have many writers in our time, and of making books there is no end, but we have few literary men. *Many are the thyrsus-bearers ; few are the mystics !* No calling is more honourable than the literary life ; but it is not easy of attainment ; it is apt, too, to be thought that mere covering of paper with ink makes the man of letters. Yet, in truth, there is a difference.

Robert Louis Stevenson was the literary man pure and simple, in the sense that Hazlitt, or Leigh Hunt, or Matthew Arnold was, and this is his most honourable distinction. Born in 1850, dying in 1894, he was devoted, from his boyhood onwards, to the art of literature, to the beauty of style, to the attainment of balanced and harmonious, if not impassioned prose. It was not enough for him to write ; he must write well, and learn the secret of the great masters. Little more than three years has passed since he died in distant Upolu, that gem set in the wide waste of the Southern seas. Flying, like Tristram Shandy, from disease to the ends of the earth, death caught him up and laid him by the heels at last in that beautiful spot which is, perhaps, nearest of all habitations to the earthly Paradise. We can never be sure of what verdict posterity will pass on any writer ; perhaps we stand too near our contemporary to call him great ; yet, if ever there was a star in the spacious firmament of English literature worthy of the place, surely Stevenson is that star. Without prejudice, too, it may be said that, though a cosmopolitan, he was too much of a Scot in his affinities ever to forget his native land. Like those of the Wizard of the North, his writings are for the most part intensely Scottish. A true patriot, he would have spurned the selfish maxim, *Ubi bene, ibi patria*. And that is saying a great deal for one whose native land possessed a climate which sent him to distant lands and over weary seas in search of health.

A man of wide sympathies, he easily took the cue from his surroundings and found in them a message for himself. Like Ulysses, he might say, "I am a part of all that I have met." For, as no other's was, his work was himself, and a transcript or transmutation of his environment. His surroundings, his studies, his experiences

must be taken into account, along with his own nature, if his writings are to be correctly understood and appreciated.

Heredity counts for so much in these days that it is indispensable if you speak of a man to mention his parents. From his father, Thomas Stevenson, the son gained some of those traits which were after to serve him in such good stead as a writer. A lover of art, of certain Latin authors, a discreet theologian, and a student of romance, chivalrous to a degree which led him into upholding unpopular theories, fond of nature and science, the father handed on to the son, who would have none of his business career, all these charming qualities and likings. Through his mother he had kinship with the Balfours of Pilrig, his grandfather, the Rev. David Balfour, being minister of Colinton and a cadet of that old Scottish house. Stevenson was thus "of a kent hoose," as the fastidious Scottish temper phrases it. The love of Bohemia, which was kept within bounds by his father, became a ruling passion with the son, and led him into curious byways of adventure in a time when Bohemia was yet a land of romance and dreams, where the artist, the literary man, and the wit could meet on common terms. Stevenson was thus a genuine Scot, and, what is more, an Edinburgh Scot. No Scots boy can quite escape his romantic surroundings—the product of strange memories and long ages of chivalrous deeds. A boy like Stevenson, with keen instincts and thirsty mind, was alive to them in every nerve. Edinburgh, be it old or new, carries a story in almost every stone. More memories of our past history throng the thoughtful wayfarer in the High Street and Canongate of that romantic town than can be counted. Phantoms of the past, in greater number than the crowd of unwashed idlers who now wander aimlessly along these classic streets, touch his elbow and whisper in his ear. And Stevenson, as he grew up, had communings with them all, and told himself a story of all the archways and corners that met his eye. He carried that love of Scotland, of his native town, far over seas, and never forgot them. Carlyle, who also expatriated himself, but no farther than London, is less identified with Scotland, though a true Scot to the last, than Stevenson will always be. In distant Samoa his eyes beheld the Hebrides and saw in vision Pentland's grassy slopes, with their musical tinkling burns; his ears still caught the bugle-blast as it rang sharp and sudden from Edinburgh's castled steep across the housetops. "Now," says he, with a pathetic and wistful note, "when I think upon my latter end, as I do sometimes, I feel that when I shall come to die out here among these beautiful islands, I shall have lost something that had been my due—my native, predestinate, and forfeited grave among honest Scots sods."

"The happiest lot on earth is to be born a Scotsman," he declares with enthusiasm. His fatherland supplied him with copious material

for one side of his nature to feed on ; the Shorter Catechism, that venerable document, was food for another, and, with the teaching of his parents, accounts for that note of austerity which sounds through all his writings. His was no lack-lustre nature, incapable of being moved, irresponsive to impressions ; he noted with a critical yet sympathetic eye everything he saw ; and if there were no story hanging odorously around it, straightway he weaved one to suit the occasion. Hence his journeyings with his father opened up only the more fresh fields and pastures new to his ruminating mind. His grandfather's manse at Colinton—still standing as it used to do when his boyish footsteps woke its echoes—a little, retired place, hedged about by deep banks and high trees, with the water of Leith rushing below its windows, was another place dear to his memory. To it we owe that charming essay, *The Manse*, happily conceived, still more happily written. And Swanston Cottage, lying in a nook of the Pentlands, within sight of the grey metropolis and the breezy Firth, gave him these hillsides for a field to wander over. Near its doors a conventicle used to gather ; further afield was the ridge where the Westland whigs were scattered by Dalrymple in 1686 ; within sound of the city's clangour, the valleys and dells of the hills offer as romantic and melancholy a beauty as could be wished for. Strange, out-of-the-way folk, such as Stevenson loved to foregather with, were to be met with there—the ancient gardener, the shepherd John Tod, the wandering beggar, the tinker of the burn of Kinneard, the broken soldier who loved Shelley and Keats, and many more.

It is easy to see how these were all formative influences in his early life, and afforded raw material out of which to weave a beautiful fabric by-and-by. At school, it is said, he was conceived to be (in schoolboy phrase) half mad ; when other boys were thinking of the cricket-field and of football he was bent on turning phrases and learning how to write. Like most children, he lived in a world of make believe ; a world bounded by the nursery walls and the garden railings, where pirates sailed the Spanish Main and Red Indians, grim and gory, flourished a flashing tomahawk ; where everything was something else and reality was as nothing compared with its use to the imagination. From childhood onwards he was a dreamer, abandoned to that luxury of the vivid mind ; consistently, in sleep and out of it, using up the full materials of life in the construction of filmy air-castles. Indeed, at a later time Stevenson, like Crabbe, found some of his best inspirations in his dreams. Ideas conceived in youth dominated his literary tastes. It is easy to give examples. If a man "has never been on a quest for buried treasure," he says in answer to Mr. Henry James, "it can be demonstrated that he has never been a child." Most of us can imagine the joy of such an imaginary quest in child-play ; we can tell whence the idea sprang—

out of romances about the Spanish Main and Captain Kidd, it is most likely ; but few, if any, of us are dominated by the idea in later life, save in an unromantic, commercial way. Stevenson, it appears, never lost sight of it. *Treasure Island* could not have been written without it ; it is the *motif* of *The Merry Men* ; it reappears in *The Treasure of Franchard* and in *The Master of Ballantrae*. He was, in fact, always asking himself, "What story can I fit on to this?" There were places which (he was sure) waited calmly on the appointed hour when some stirring action, or some gruesome tragedy, should affront them and rouse their echoes. There were places which, failing all else, must occupy themselves with the creatures of his fancy—Edinburgh, the sand-dunes of North Berwick, the ancient seaport of South Queensferry, the Western Highlands. All these are memorable places for the student of his writings. "There was no end to his supposing," writes a friend. It was the same with the people he read of and the people he met. They stuck in his memory ; many of them figure in his stories and would be surprised, could they know it, to find with what faithful finger they were drawn. He used up his own experiences ; the novels, tales, and essays are compacted of them, real or imagined. Time and again, to those who know anything of his boyhood and youth, an event, a description, speak eloquently of some similar circumstance in which he had figured, and which remained in the memory until called forth, a fairy Ariel, by this Prospero to do his bidding. Like Rousseau, he had the most intense consciousness of his own existence. No object that had once made an impression on him was ever after effaced.

It has been already said that he learned to write. Books were food to him from earliest childhood, and they awoke in him, one after another, a responsive chord, which presently set him imitating the writer's style and matter. Shakespeare, Montaigne, Bunyan, Spenser, Wordsworth, Whitman, George Meredith, to name but a few, were favourites from the first, and fell victims to his imitative craft. If genius, as is erroneously supposed, be the capacity for taking infinite pains, then Stevenson, in this sense, was a genius, learning to write in the same way as Alphonse Daudet, turning phrases as he walked, noting down a description in his version-book, constructing a story, a poem, a drama, in the manner of the favourite of the hour. It is better that literary work should thus acquire carefulness, polish, delicate chiselling, than that we should be swept away before that flood of slipshod English sent abroad by "the mob of gentlemen who write with ease" in those evil days on which we have fallen. People will exclaim that this method smells of the lamp. For our part, we are content that it should be so. After all, in literature as in life, the goal is reached by a strait and narrow way.

At school and at college he would have none of the ordinary pabulum; he preferred to "babble o' green fields" rather than put his nose to the educational grindstone. His father before him had been a mere idler at school; he, for his part, for no consideration was to be bound to these narrow paths of virtue where Latin supports the scholar on one side and the mathematics on the other. The brook tinkled, the birds sang, the sun shone, here was a pleasant book, and life was a merry pageant, and off went our truant with his cap flung in the air. This truant disposition may give great enjoyment to him who has it, and lead him into many a pleasant by-path meadow, but it will be a sore annoyance to constituted authorities, and to all dons, professors, pedagogues, and proctors. When Stevenson went to Professor Blackie to obtain his certificate of attendance at his class, that blithe Grecian positively declared more than once that he did not know him as any student of his. Professor Fleeming Jenkyn was equally placed in an equivocal position, but was also equally candid. "It is quite useless for *you* to come, Mr. Stevenson," said he. "There may be doubtful cases: there is no doubt about yours. You have simply *not* attended my class." Yet he did acquire various scraps of scholastic knowledge by which he set great store. "I still remember," says he, gravely, "that the spinning of a top is a case of kinetic stability. I still remember that emphyseus is not a disease, nor stillicide a crime." Knowledge is a powerful possession, and it is by such unconsidered trifles as these that many of us acquire a considerable reputation.

But if any one should suppose that Stevenson was a mere loafer and idler he would be hugely mistaken. He played truant from college and the desk that he might be an assiduous student of nature, of men, and of books. Like Valentine in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, he might have said—

"though myself have been an idle truant,
 Onitting the sweet benefit of time,
 To clothe myself with angel-like perfection;
 Yet hath Sir Proteus, for that's his name,
 Made use and fair advantage of his days;
 His years but young, but his experiences old,
 His head unmellowed, but his judgment ripe."

For Stevenson, if Scotsman over did, deserved that old Scottish epithet, "a lad of parts." We cannot be sorry that he made his own selection of the chapters he would mark and learn in the book of knowledge, when we consider the treasures which resulted from these disinterested studies. With the greatest inclination to wander afield and see all the clangour of life, its high achievements and golden vineyards, he was yet busily teaching himself and others the lesson of contentment. "Did you ever see a squirrel turning in a cage, and another squirrel sitting philosophically over his nuts?"

asks the stranger in *Will o' the Mill*, and then goes on to say, "I needn't ask you which of them looked more of a fool." So Stevenson would have all men do their duty, seek out the possibilities of life, yet not wander idly into fields where they have no business, nor occupy themselves with matters too strange or knowledge too high for them. Distance, he would remind you, lends enchantment to the view.

It was settled that he should be an engineer, and follow, Hindu fashion, the profession of his fathers. "Alas!" he sighed, "to hear a man, be he Fleeming Jenkyn himself, lecturing about strains on a bridge is all very well. But, after all, where is the human interest in strains on a bridge?" Hawthorne somewhere speaks of the shades of his forefathers marvelling at his literary tastes. "A writer of story-books! What kind of business in life, what mode of glorifying God, or being serviceable to mankind in his day and generation may that be? Why, the degenerate fellow might as well have been a fiddler." That resembles Stevenson's position, but he was not to be put to shame. When he should have been studying engineering he was courting the muse and inditing a Covenanting novel, and working himself into a fever with fearful doubts as to the likelihood of his literary immortality. The outer and accidental circumstances of the engineering profession alone attracted him; the hazards upon slippery rocks, the sounding sea, the nipping, briny winds, the amphibious life, the glory of summer in the Western isles. We owe to this part of his career that racy essay, *Some Passages in the Life of an Engineer*, that other, *Memories of an Islet*, and his sympathetic memoir of the professor whose lectures were so great a weariness to the flesh to this nimble spirit. But such an engineer, for all his fine writing, would have been a mockery of the sacred family traditions. Accordingly the law was tried next, and in due time Stevenson was called to the bar. He has been known to wear the wig and gown; that he practised is more than has ever been averred. Indeed, the keeper of the Parliament House used to show his gown to sight-seers, with the words, "Here is the gown o' a laddie that does nae work—that daft laddie, Stevenson." Literature was still the potent factor in his life, the syren who, happily for the world, beguiled him from making bridges and pleading before the outer or inner houses.

Those who like to forecast the future genius in the precocious child will see the budding *littérateur* in a work Stevenson wrote as a child of six. It was called *A History of Moses*, and was resplendent with pictures, showing the Israelites following that great law-giver into the wilderness and smoking serious pipes. What is more to the purpose is found in *The Pentland Rising, A Page of History, 1666*. It was published by an Edinburgh bookseller, a little pamphlet of some score pages with a flaring green cover. Stevenson

at this date was only a boy of sixteen. The book follows the contemporary accounts of the rising given by Kirkton, Sir James Turner, and others. Yet it is a free and flowing narrative, wonderfully told, with an evident sympathy for the Covenanters (a sympathy which disappears with maturer years), and graced by picturesque epithet and balanced style. This was in 1866. About five years later appeared that *College Magazine*, about which he waxes so humorously pathetic in *Memories and Portraits*. He writes slightly enough of it there, but, in truth, the essays contributed by him to its pages have much of the delicacy and grace which mark his later work. Copies of these four fugitive numbers are now highly valued by the bibliophile for Stevenson's sake, and fetch a long price in the book-market. These were the days when he cultivated the flowing locks of the poet, and wore the loose velvet jacket which the æsthetic vogue had made common. By 1873 he had made the acquaintance of Mr. Sidney Colvin, who in turn introduced him to P. G. Hamerton, himself both artist and author. Hamerton was at that time editor of the *Portfolio*, and it was in its pages that Stevenson next appeared. His love for the Bohemian aspects of country life appears in his first essay, that entitled "Roads." Of the others, the very titles attract the fancy and promise complete satisfaction to the reader. Stevenson's earliest work took the essay form; it will probably be found that in this field his best and most lasting work was done.

It is curious to find him about this time publishing anonymously *An Appeal to the Clergy of the Church of Scotland*, wherein the ministers of that communion are advised to make such pecuniary sacrifices as will enable their brethren of the Free Kirk to return to it, if they wish to. Here was a piece of generous Quixotry; the advice seems somewhat gratuitous, if not impertinent, in times when the value of teinds had already begun to fall; and what is more to the point, it has never appeared that any minister followed the advice given. But the pamphlet will stand side by side with that unquestionably generous tribute to Father Damien which was, later on, to speak with trumpet tones against the comfortable detractors of that good priest. Romantic minds like Stevenson's are usually optimistic, and more than one literary man has seen himself turn ecclesiastic, theologian, and philosopher, when he might least have expected it.

Stevenson had leanings to the artistic life; he was a passable and dainty sketcher; several engravings and etchings of his own reveal a studied quaintness and unique interpretation of nature which is as idealistic as it is impressionist. It is that touch of the artist's mind which gives so pleasant a twang of mother earth to so many of his pages and makes him, to some extent, a Wordsworth in prose. When it became evident that the literary life was open to him, fortunately for the world he sought the society of artists. He

became an *habitué* of the Latin Quarter, where he was a great favourite; the ancient and royal forest of Fontainebleau, beloved of artists, knew him well; indeed, at this period France was as much his home as Scotland. All this was not without effect upon his literary work; it attained a greater breadth and more of that *esprit* for which we may well envy our French cousins; moreover, some of his writings are cast in a certain French mould which no student of that literature can mistake. The travel sketches have a French crispness. *The Treasure of Franchard* and that delightful story *Providence and the Guitar* might have been written by M. Daudet; while such essays as *Charles of Orleans* and *François Villon* show his passion for those romantic poets of a country which, like our own, has so much romance in her history. The essay, *Forest Notes*, published at this time, is a graphic picture of Fontainebleau, admirable alike for its naturalness and precision. And here it may be observed that few writers are so faithful in their interpretation and description of nature as is Stevenson. Its grim as well as its beautiful aspects attracted him, and both are exactly depicted with the minuteness of a pre-Raphaelite and the magic of a Turner. He is not so copious as Ruskin, but he is equally precise; not so luxurious as Tennyson, but quite as much master of the correct epithet; not so classically cold as Matthew Arnold, but equally sincere. The essays are full of this; the novels, too, contain many a brilliant piece of word-painting. That passage in *The Merry Men* where Gordon Darnaway discourses on the terrors of the sea is grimness itself. "The sea—a muckle yett to hell!" But the sweeter phases of nature are recalled in many a passage which haunts the memory and is musical to the ear. Akin to this is the vivid method by which he huddles a whole volume of descriptive writing into a single paragraph, each phrase a photograph, each sentence opening up a world of vision and of glowing life. Vagueness is no evidence of imaginative greatness; detail, vivid yet true colouring speak of it as nothing else can. People believed Dante had been in hell, because of his exact measurements and copious numbers and lurid landscapes. So with Stevenson. He has seen everything he tells us of; he has a vivid presentation of it in his mind; and the copiousness of that vivid presentation is, properly speaking, the source of all true imaginative work. "If you want people to weep," says Horace, "you must first weep yourself." If a writer would have us see, with sympathy, what he writes about, he must first have seen it, even (to use St. John's words) "gazed and gazed" upon it, for himself. Hence the greatness of Homer, of Dante, of Shakespeare. Stevenson was quick to perceive this and to act upon it.

To return to the essays. Probably the earliest writings of his to attract attention were the exquisite essays in the *Cornhill* of 1877, afterwards collected in the volume *Virginibus Puerisque*. These at

once told the world that a new writer of genius had set his foot on the stage. Hazlitt, Lamb, Bacon, Montaigne are the great essayists of literature. But Stevenson must be joined with these great names. He has the same charm, the same inimitable grace, the same breadth of view. Of these, Montaigne becomes more of a friend as we grow older; Hazlitt is frankly an egoist; Lamb is always garrulous and pleasant; Bacon is stately and severe, but seldom reveals himself. Stevenson combines these qualities, but has chiefly the manner of Montaigne. He takes you into his confidence and will not let you away till you have known some of his secrets. Not all, however; for on some subjects Stevenson could be as silent and reserved as a Trappist monk. But in this delightful personal note the likeness to Montaigne is seen more than ever. In both there is the same transcript of individual experiences, emotions, likes, and dislikes. And their charm for the reader lies in this, that though he has never penned a line, he can say as he reads: I have felt this, I have thought that. Who that has read *Old Mortality* does not recall the misanthropic humours and heroic love-affairs of youth? And so in a hundred other authentic instances.

Yet as an essayist he is no mere trifler. He touches deep soundings in human experience. *Punch's* famous advice to those about to marry is also Stevenson's, but he qualifies it afterwards by saying "Do." "If you have failed with your own life," he says (and he means that no one has much to boast of in this respect), "are you likely to manage better when married? . . . If she were only your sister, and you thought half so much of her, how doubtfully would you entrust her future to a man no better than yourself! . . . Your wife will be a witness of your sins, a judge, and a victim. . . . To marry is to domesticate the recording angel." Nevertheless, he goes on, "to hold back is to run away from the battle. It is lawful to pray God that we be not led into temptation, but not lawful to skulk from those that come to us." With the churches he advises men to have faith, and to live in hope that their faults will spur them on to do better and to love better. Outwardly cynical, these essays on love and marriage have much to commend them to the notice of the aspiring Benedick who would outstrip the angels in audacity. His theories on these subjects are pleasanter to listen to than Hazlitt's, who wrote with as much frankness but with far less chivalry.

This wise candour illuminates the other essays of this series. Each time of life, he would have us believe, has its appropriate environment and products. "The true wisdom is to be always seasonable. . . . To love playthings well as a child; to lead an adventurous and honourable youth; and to settle when the time arrives into a green and smiling age, is to be a good artist in life and to deserve well both of yourself and your neighbour." That is

sound advice. But if he, with us all, found youth a delusive and ever-retreating dream, he still strove hard to retain the youthful spirit. And few succeeded so well. Charles Kingsley kept his share of animal spirits to the last; even Matthew Arnold showed the boyish love of fun in baiting the Philistines. But somehow Stevenson kept hold of the secret of youth and its charms long after youth had gone. Few have interpreted children so well as life, as *Child's Play* and *A Child's Garden of Verses* remind us; still fewer have remained to the end such enthusiasts for youth and adventure. "Youth is the time to go flashing from one end of the world to the other both in mind and body; to try the manners' of different nations; to hear the chimes at midnight; to see sunrise in town and country; to be converted at a revival; to circumnavigate the metaphysics, write halting verses, run a mile to see a fire, and wait all day in the theatre to applaud Hernani." Hence he is no lover of dulness and prudence. His pet object of scorn was Samuel Budgett, the successful merchant. "Give me," he exclaims, "the young man with brains enough to make a fool of himself." This seems a startling doctrine (and it runs through all he wrote), but it is easy to see what is meant. To make money, to know more languages than most other men, to live in a cloister and forget God's sunshine, these are laudable enough ambitions, but we should not forget that they do not exhaust the possibilities of life. The conclusion he brings us to is that we should cultivate the finer feelings, lest the sober employments of life should stifle them, and the time of enjoyment never come. Above all, we should be afraid of neither life nor death. Not even Browning excels him in expounding the lesson of boldness and thoroughness in our actions. It is easy to see that he touches a high, heroic note in his teaching, and it explains his own buoyancy and the spirit of romantic enthusiasm which is so pleasing in his novels.

A less philosophic but a more frankly autobiographical and softer note is touched in the later essays. Age has softened the crude ideas of youth. There you have the crisp and mellow reflections of one looking backward across the years that are no more. He lingers with love over faded memories. The world, he knew, has many attractions; but, after all, home, the old familiar faces, the old loves, the old books are best. "When I was a boy," he writes, "I was a bit puzzled, and hardly knew whether it was myself or the world that was curious and worth looking into. Now I know it is myself and stick to that." We may rejoice at his decision, for it has given us one of the most delicate and refined exponents of human life, and especially of that human life which Stevenson knew most of—his own.

In his criticisms, Stevenson, because he knew himself so well, at once seems to see with the eyes of his author and to know his mind.

What fine discrimination in his essay on that enigma of seventeenth-century character, Samuel Pepys! What anatomising and analysis of François Villon, blackguard and poet! It is doubtful if any of the host of writers who have blamed or excused Robert Burns has arrived more nearly at the truth than this keen critic in his famous essay on the "Old Hawk." Yet he neither weeps nor grows abusive. He is sane, truthful, judicious. Or take that other on John Knox. Dr. McRie's portly tomes shiver and collapse before the humour and knowledge of this short study.

To that youthful and adventurous spirit of which we have spoken we owe some of the most delightful travel-pictures that have ever been penned. Each of them reveals the same desire to test the meaning of life at different points. Two of Stevenson's curious journeys took place in France—his canoe voyage with Sir Walter Simpson in 1877, and his solitary journey on foot through the Cevennes in 1878. Solitary, but how could he be solitary with Modestine, subject of alternate blows and caresses, a steed which will surely rank in future with Bucephalus and Rosinante! Later on he crossed the Atlantic in the steerage of an emigrant ship, and the great plains of America in a train, and of both journeys he has given the record. There are no loud-sounding adventures in these sketches; but there is exact colouring, the evidence of a mind attuned to the passing scene and ready to listen to its voices, of a heart which pined for fields and woods and hills. Here there is not the glaring correctness of a photograph, but the work of an imaginative and sympathetic artist. Things seen and heard have passed through the alembic of his own brain and been transmuted into the fine gold. Stevenson has lent a part of his personality to every page. Withal there is a piquancy, an antique flavour in these books; to read them is to inhale the scent of the earth and of an old herb-garden after long pining in a sick-room; a serious passage jostles one full of a quiet and sarcastic humour; in truth, no books of travel remind one more of Sterne than do these; but there is no aping a pathos which is not felt, and no coquetting with unpleasant themes.

Stevenson's earliest attempts in the field of fiction were short sketches; the first of these, *The Story of a Lie*, is replete with all the grace and power which marked his later work. As a novelist it was Stevenson's fate to quicken the long dead love of pure romance. And in his stories there is no dull moralising, no *double entendre*, nor, happily, is our author the writer of novels with a purpose. He simply tells a story, and, to say truth, that is what the world always likes. Hence the long life of Homer, of the *Arabian Nights*, of the national ballads. Hence, too, the inevitable oblivion which awaits nine-tenths of the "literature" which froths and foams in our time. With Stevenson (and, happily, many have followed him)

every incident, every phrase, has its place, and serves to usher you to the *dénouement*. And you have all the pleasure of being carried out of yourself for the time, out of the whirl of kirk or market, into a world whose sun gives the "light that never was on sea or land." *Treasure Island* at once sets you on shipboard. You smell the brine and feel that you are off on a quest for buried treasure. ; *The Master of Ballantrae*, *Kidnapped*, *Catriona*, plunge you, with the speed of Prince Houssain's magic carpet, into the Scottish world just after the '45. And there you remain till you have closed the book. In writing this trilogy Stevenson wisely chose the period after the conflict, though the passionate force it stirred still swelled. For his sympathies were doubtful; had he written of the strife itself (as Scott did) he would have found himself in the equivocal position of one who would run with the hare and hunt with the hounds, who doubts whether George is not as good as Charles or James. Stevenson was a doubtful Jacobite; he was also, however, a more than doubtful whig. As to the style in which these stories are written it is indefinable, yet it haunts the memory. It has just that touch of archaism which hints at the veritable date of the story, and just that balance and harmoniousness which recall the English classics. Stevenson's early environment, his love of exciting situations, his knowledge of all such situations in his own country's story, his fondness for Scott and Dumas, explain his novels. He loved the romantic side of things, of the sea, of adventure. He had a passion for the weird and bizarre, which he exercised to the full in such stories as *Thravn Janet* and *Markheim*, and in such a play as *Deacon Brodie*. And, once more, the mysterious side of life attracted him, and attracts us too, in his *Master of Ballantrae*, in *The Pavilion on the Links*. There were few forms of the novel which he did not experiment in, witness *Primer Otto*, and, generally speaking, he won success. Indeed, the variety of his themes, though by no means equal, is yet akin to the similar variety of Balzac.

Treasure Island is, properly speaking, a boys' book, but, like *Robinson Crusoe* (the only book with which it ought to be compared, though *Reuben Davidger* runs it close), children of a larger growth are fascinated by it. There is not a dull page in it, and every incident seems to be, in turn, more effective than the other. We hurry through it, eager to be in at the death; we feel, at the end, as if we had been among the pirates and endured many a strange adventure; and then we read it again, rolling it, like a sweet morsel, under the tongue. Nothing, again, can be more effective than the opening chapters of *The Master of Ballantrae*; they have the same glamour as suffuses *The Antiquary* and *The Heart of Midlothian*. Yet, as we go on, the story drags somewhat, and it is only towards the end that the same breathless interest is awakened. The truth is that in all Stevenson's novels there is a deficiency of plot. His strongest

point lay in the effectiveness of incident and in the number of such incidents he was capable of giving, and also in the power of his dialogue. Each character speaks as actively and strongly as if he were playing a game of fives. Such incidents in *The Master* as the duel by candlelight, the discovery that the body is gone, the Master acting as tailor in New York, the camp in the forest, the resurrection of the Master, are really inimitable, and carry their air of convincing reality with them. So, in *Kidnapped* and *Catriona*, it is more the incidents and the conversations that please than the plot. In the former one feels one's heart in one's mouth all the time David Balfour is wandering and escaping disaster. In the latter there are situations powerfully conceived and as powerfully described. As for the characters, Alan Breck has the true Stevenson trade-mark upon him; Miss Grant has walked bodily out of some unwritten novel of Scott's, there is no denying her vitality; the Lord Advocate and James More are duplicates of the same character, only James inclines to the side of vice and the Advocate to the side of virtue. David and Catriona make love in a manner peculiarly Stevensonian, and a trifle artificially. Some one has said that Stevenson never was in love, but that as a friend he was unequalled, and there is probably as much truth in this as in most epigrammatic sayings. *Catriona* as a whole will, no doubt, rank as the finest of his completed novels.

One other thing limits the field of many of his novels, and that is the autobiographical style of telling the story. Of course the omniscience of the novelist and the judicious use of other sources when necessary amplify the constricted sphere in which the narrator dwells. Still, no one can use this manner long without seeing its narrowing effect upon the complete result. It is doubtful, again, whether he has given us a large gallery of really flesh-and-blood characters, like Fielding or Thackeray. We almost feel that we are dealing with mere puppets, not men and women, yet puppets endowed with an amazing mechanism which we are easily deluded into taking for life itself. This is seen at its height in the *New Arabian Nights*, but few of his stories escape it. It probably resulted from his living so much in a land of make believe, and from his "always supposing." Hence, some of his characters are unconvincing, if not farcical, and certainly fantastic. You can never be sure how they will jerk their limbs next. For all that, none but Stevenson could have imagined them. He himself is all his characters; he has given to each a pound of his own flesh; but is not the vital blood wanting? He speaks again and again in his essays of the infinite capabilities of the human spirit. "There is nothing so monstrous but that we can believe it of ourselves." The novels are expositions of this text, and show us Stevenson posing; now as this, now as that other of his characters.

As a writer of short stories Stevenson was unequalled. It may

seem easy to write a short story, but the truth is a long work of fiction is not so difficult an undertaking. How are you to give the hint of true character, to make the presentment vivid and the incidents truthful in a few pages? There must be compression without the evidence of it. A short story is easy enough in one sense, but a short story which will be readable, which you will go back to with pleasure, is not a common object in literature. The French excel us in this, but Stevenson runs them very close. *The Pavilion on the Links* is a good example of his powers. The story of the Italians tracking the vile banker to that lonely house on the bleak and desolate seaboard is unique of its kind. There is the usual element of the mysterious and the weird; we are fairly in Stevenson land: there are whiffs of the sea, dark nights, flashing lights, and mysterious voices. Yet once more the figures are mere puppets. Northmour is a doubtful figure with his coarse humours; Cassilis is nothing so much as Stevenson's double; Clara is better and more lifelike; her father is more in Stevenson's best vein—a kind of Master of Ballantrae quoting Scripture and masking his sensual vices under a covering of hypocrisy. *Thrown Saint*, again, is still shorter, but it is a fearsome piece of gruesome *diablerie* told in the lowland dialect and tricked out by the effective use of Scots words, fear-inspiring in sound and meaning alike, yet with all that circumstance of grim humour which is never absent from the stories of the lowlander. To convey its full flavour to the mind, it should be read alone at the mirk midnight hour, but with help within call, as the results may be disastrous. *The Merry Men* is homelier, though not wanting in horror. The lonely island with the booming of the sea, the glorying of the Calvinist in his ill-gotten gains mixed with his fears of the sea, his sudden horror at the appearance of the black man, and then the clap of judgment which turns his brain and hustles him on to his death—all this is most admirably told, together with that tang of the sea, that vision of Spanish treasure, that appearance of piratical visitors, of which Stevenson was so fond.

In a different vein, full of a subtle pathos, is that sweet sketch, *Will o' the Mill*. It has something of the manner of the best German story-tellers; that homely, pensive style, that gentle kind of character-drawing which we find in them. The chief difference is that in this study there is more of the conscious, or it may be self-conscious artist. We are back again in the weird, mysterious region in such stories as *Olalla* and *A Lodging for the Night*. The latter, a story of François Villon, reads like a chapter from his biography, so lifelike is the presentation, so well have the horror and the wintry cold struck into it. In his short stories Stevenson seems to occupy a middle place between Hawthorne and Poe. He is neither so moonstruck an idealist as the former, nor so ghastly a realist as the latter. If he does terrify us now and then, the feeling

is mixed with delight and wonder at his marvellous skill, his absolute precision in his epithets and phrases, his consummate artistic power.

Stevenson was never one to go with the scorers who, in their writings, with a demoniac art make sin look a pleasant thing. He had been well trained in a stern but upright faith; he knew that morality was the braver path to follow; and his books witness to the worth of the virtues and the religious sentiments. "It is by our evil," says Charles to his uncle in *The Merry Men*, "that God leads us into good; we sin, I dare not say by His temptation, but I must say with His consent; and to any but the brutish man his sins are the beginning of wisdom." No more accurate and sound statement was ever penned outside of a sermon. It is of a piece with the purview of religion and ethics which Stevenson always takes, and one feels thankful that after writing so much he still kept constant to these high ideals. In his own way he was what we might call a lay preacher. His essays are of the stoical cast; he is for no deep renunciations, yet still he sees that life demands many a sacrifice from us, and that its true secret is not to be grasped by the self-seeker. But in certain of his short stories the note of the preacher rings out loudly, as in *Markheim* and *Dr. Jekyll*, which, apart from the sombre thoughts they arouse deserve well of the student of morals. Both are sermons on that strange duality of nature which we find in ourselves, with this difference—that Markheim believes himself the mere creature of circumstances, circumstances which Jekyll courted and played into the hands of, knowing well that he was free to baffle them. St. Paul told us long ago "the evil that I would not, that I do." It is almost as if Stevenson had taken this as his text, and, seeing the vast capabilities, both moral and artistic, lying dormant in it, had preached from it with the tongue of a master.

One other matter in connection with the novels falls to be considered here—the criticism that he has given us no effective heroine. This would be a serious defect if true. But he has done this as well as most; for few men can give much more than a lay-figure when discussing a heroine, just as women's heroes are seldom other than women posing as men. Scott gave us few real women, Dickens none, Thackeray not many. In the regions of the drama it is different; Shakespeare's women are all alive, so are Goethe's. For all that, where were the critic's eyes? One who discoursed so fluently of love and marriage was not likely to leave the subject alone when he ventured afield into the blithe regions of romance. What do they make of Mary in *The Merry Men*, of Olalla, of Catriona, of Miss Grant, of that sportive damsel in *The Story of a Lie*, of Alison Graeme? One will not say that he holds a brief for the sex, or that he has succeeded any better than most novelists

of his own sex. He is no amourist and would have cut a poor figure as a troubadour; yet he is wise, candid, and once or twice touches a passionate note.

As a novelist Stevenson has been set on a level with Scott, but surely this is but the ignorant enthusiasm of the *claqueur*; and one is sorry for those who believe it. For all that he is characterised by the same qualities as Scott, only lesser in degree. To him, as to Scott, man is the traveller afoot through time, and it is on the broad highway of human sympathies that he sits and tells his tales. But Scott's trumpet tones, his colossal genius, his massive strength, his wide canvas, his numerous interests, he has nothing of. He does share with him his glamour, his vividness, his manliness, his love of a sheer story. He gives us few mere lay-figures; Scott has given us a dozen. As a story-teller he is, perhaps, as clever, but Scott is infinitely greater. Scott is a general marshalling brigades; Stevenson is but a captain with his company. Both do their work, however, with equal vigour and love, and with equal success on their own level. One thing Scott could not do: he could not write essays like Stevenson's nor was he master of such a magic style.

In many ways Stevenson was a unique literary phenomenon. But nothing is so unique as his life in Upolu. Landor lived all his days in Rome; Byron fell in love with Greece and Italy; but Stevenson, combining the functions of barbaric king, story-teller in chief to the islanders, and man of letters, is quite unparalleled. Yet, in that lonely sea-girt isle, he was like nothing so much as Prospero, summoning Ariel and his elves to do his bidding. That exile was for the sake of health, yet, though he was always weak and ill, there is scarce a trace of it in his writings: they are not sad; the beautiful essay, *Ordered South*, is the only one where he poses as the invalid, yet even there he is cheerful. For he was not one to wear his heart on his sleeve, nor does he depict the deeper emotions with much passion. Only the strong man and the wealthy can afford to be pathetic. He has certainly none of that cheap, maudlin sentiment which, adopted from France, delights in making its bow to the reader and saying, "Look how pathetic I am!" Yet, now and again he speaks a word of real pathos, all the more striking because it is so rare — especially in *Child's Play*, *El Dorado*, and *Ordered South*. To him living and working had their rewards; he kept a bold face and a warm heart to the end, lest by giving way to his pains and weakness he should lose sight of the generous emotions which he loved. He agreed with Browning that a bold start and a great failure are better than whimpering cowardice and paltry aims. And if he expressed his beliefs jestingly, and thought that a good dinner and a bottle of wine are sufficient answers to the brevity and uncertainty of existence, after all he spoke not without truth. For we do not

value our good things enough, and we are all apt to listen with an over-grave sincerity to the moaning of the Preacher.

To the end Stevenson's was a fine nature, capable of many thrills, educated to appreciate niceties that others, more gross, would pass by. To the end he was a keen observer of life, a careful, painstaking writer, a master of curious phrases and of style. He was no st^oic, yet there was in him the stoic gravity and austerity, the product, shall we say? of climate and race *plus* a grounding in the Shorter Catechism. Nor yet is he an epicurean, though there were few parts of life which he had not made trial of. He has been called a Pyrrhonist, like Montaigne, but it is difficult to see the reason for the title. It is true that now and then his mind is in a state of balance, but, for the most part, he is too certain in his opinions, too dogmatic in stating them, to continue long in a state of suspended judgment. He changed, as age went on, in his thoughts and opinions; but to pass from one pole to another is a different thing from remaining balanced betwixt the two. To science, writing (as he said) "with the cold finger of a star-fish," he was less than just; its methods were too cut and dried for his romantic temperament; it shattered illusions and the *aberglaube* of life. This is all the more curious when we think of his precision in the use of language. He laughed consumedly at Darwin's "hairy ancestor, probably arboreal," though the theory of heredity struck him, and is put to a pretty use in one of his best essays. The myth of Pan was more cheering by far to his heart than the message of science. For, in moments when the glow and colour and mystery of life prevail, "the mind refuses to be satisfied with evolution, and demands a ruddier presentation of the sum of existence."

J. A. MACCULLOCH.

CLARENCE MANGAN AND HIS POETRY.

THE question, Are we helped to a better understanding of a poet's work, or a more delicate appreciation of its beauties, by being made acquainted with every detail of his life? is one which different people will doubtless variously decide. Few will deny, however, that many things might well be wrapped in

"Th' oblivious grave's inviolable shade."

But, before considering a poet's work, we are entitled to ask what were his opportunities; what has he done: has he left anything that we will not willingly let die; has he given utterance to noble thoughts in beautiful language? These are vital questions; let us see how they are answered in Mangan's case.

The story of his life is sad in the extreme. A grocer's son, like Moore, he had not, however, owing to the *res angusta domi*, the advantage which Moore had of a university education, but was early brought to the knowledge of the truth contained in Johnson's line—

"Slow rises worth by poverty depressed."

Owing to the improvidence of his father, who died while he was yet a child, he was, with two brothers and a sister, left to the care of his maternal uncle, who sent him, when he had reached his seventh year, to a school in Saul's Court, off Fishamble Street, presided over by the Rev. Michael Blake, afterwards Bishop of Dromore, and whose memory is indissolubly associated with the restoration of the Irish College in Rome. Here, under the care of Father Graham, a learned and classical scholar, he acquired the rudiments of Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish; and his perfect knowledge of German was obtained from Father Villanueva, a learned priest with whom he studied for some time after leaving school. His uncle being unable to continue his maintenance, he, at this early age, found himself obliged to help towards the support of his brothers and sister, and he availed of his proficiency in German to give lessons to young pupils; but the income derived from this being

altogether inadequate, he, at the age of seventeen, entered a scrivener's office, where he toiled for seven weary years, and then exchanged that slavery for the no less dreary drudgery of an attorney's office.

There is in this episode in Mangan's life something not altogether remotely analogous to that of poor Charles Lamb, whose soul revolted against the slavery of the desk and the office, but Lamb's bondage was of much longer duration. "Thirty years," said he, "have I served the Philistines, and my neck is not subdued to the yoke."

Into most men's lives, at one period or another, enters the passion of love: well is it for them then if the object be worthy. It may lead only to the suckling of fools and chronicling of small beer, or it may lift them to the heights of noble ambition and lofty purpose. Mangan was unfortunate: he wasted his adoration and affection on a coquette. He thought she returned his love, but he was deceived:

"Alas! the illusion soon vanished.
I awoke. There were clouds in the sky.
My tears began to flow.
My quiet of soul was banished;
I felt as though
I could die!"

Ever afterwards the world's "fair tints" were for him

"All blent in one dusk hue."

He who under the gentle sway of a good woman's love might have found the happiness hitherto denied him became almost as an outcast, crushed and in despair, his yearnings after better things food for the laughter and scorn of those debasing companions whom the struggle for existence had brought into his life. Small wonder that, as he tells us himself,

"He fell far through that pit abysmal,
The gulf and grave of Maginn and Burns."

With his whole heart he hated the work he had to do. "Melancholy," said Dr. Johnson, "should be diverted by every means but drinking." Unhappily, Mangan had no one to save him, at least so it seemed, until Dr. Todd, the learned antiquarian, found for him more congenial occupation in cataloguing in Trinity College Library. A brighter future now opened before him. This employment brought him the acquaintance of the celebrated George Petrie, who proved himself his friend, and got for him an appointment in the Ordnance Survey Office. Here he became intimate with the great Celtic scholars, John O'Donovan and Eugene O'Curry, from whom he learned the beauties of the old Celtic ballads. Their

prose renderings he transfused into English verse, preserving with wonderful fidelity the spirit of the originals. Some translations by him from the German appeared in Petrie and O'Donovan's *Dublin Penny Journal*, and to the *Dublin University Magazine* he contributed for several years; then, in succession, to the *Irish Penny Journal*, the *Nation*, and to John Mitchel's *United Irishman*. John Mitchel first saw him in Trinity College Library, perched on a ladder, a strange Dominie Sampson-like figure, and later was introduced to him at the *Nation* office. He was attracted by the personality of the man, and divined with unerring instinct, through the grotesque outward appearance, the genius that was hidden within. He tried to do for him what the woman he had foolishly loved could have achieved had she had the insight, but it was too late. On the path of life there is no turning back, and he had gone so far in the wrong direction that to turn aside was well-nigh fruitless.

The rest is soon told. An outbreak of cholera in the city claimed him as a victim, and in the Meath Hospital, whither he had been removed through the kindness of his friend the good Father Meehan, the weary spirit left the wasted frame.

All this and more will be found set forth with much minuteness of detail in the recently published *Life*; but our concern is not with the mortal part of him, it is all too sad and wretched. Turn we rather to his poetry. For Irishmen at home and abroad this will ever have a charm and a fascination which "age cannot wither nor custom stale."

Forty years ago a considerable portion of it was, with loving hands, collected and edited by John Mitchel, who prefaced the volume with a biography which as a thing of beauty in English prose has few equals. That volume has since remained the standard edition, considerable care being evinced in the selection.

Apart from his strictly original poems, many of which have great beauty, we think that all lovers of poetry will find a pleasure in perusing his many beautiful translations from the German which are indued with all the charm of originality. No one but a poet can at all adequately translate poetry; the elusive beauty is lost to any others who attempt it.

"Contempt awaits that artist ever

What plods through all, a mere machine."

Perhaps of no other language is it so true as of German that it presents to the translator difficulties almost insurmountable; there are words that are untranslatable, and inversions of forms of expression that frequently deprive a too literal versification of the beauty and grace of the original. Let us see with how much fidelity to his author Mangan adhered in these verses from Schiller's "Song of the Bell":

Was in des Dammes tiefer Grube
Die Hand mit Feuers Hilfe baut,
Hoch auf des Turmes Glockenstube,
Da wird es von uns zeugen laut.
Noch dauern wird's in späten Tagen
Und rühren vieler Menschen Ohr
Und wird mit dem Betrübten klagen
Und stimmen zu der Andacht Chor.
Was unten tief dem Erdensohne
Das wechselnde Berhängnis bringt,
Das schlägt an die metallne Krone,
Die es erbaulich weiter klingt.

* * * *

Der Meister kann die Form zer-
brechen
Mit weiser Hand, zur rechten Zeit ;
Doch wehe, wenn in Flammenbächen
Das glühnde Erz sich selbst befreit !
Blindwütend, mit des Donners Krachen,
Zersprengt es das geborstne Haus,
Und wie aus offenem Höllemachen
Speit es Berderben zündend aus.
Wo rohe Kräfte sinnlos walten,
Da kann sich kein Gebild gestalten ;

Wenn sich die Bolker selbst befreien,
Da kann die Wohlfahrt nicht gedeihn

What here in caverns by the power
Of fire our mastering fingers frame,
Hereafter from the belfry tower
Will vindicate its maker's aim ;
'Twill speak to Man with voice unfailling
In latest years of after-days,
Will echo back the mourner's wailing,
Or move the heart to prayer and praise.
In many a varying cadence ringing,
The willing BELT will publish far
The fitful changes hourly springing
Beneath MAN'S ever-shifting star.

* * * *

The Master's hand, what time he wills,

May break the mould, but woe to ye
If, spreading far in fiery rills,
The glowing ore *itself* shall free !
With fear as when deep thunder crashes
It blindly blasts the house to ashes,
And as from Hell's abyssal deep
The death tide rolls with lava sweep.
Where lawless force is awless master
Stands naught of noble, naught
sublime ;
Where Freedom comes achieved by
Crime
Her fruits are tumult and disaster.

And again in his rendering of the same poet's "Hoffnung":

Es reden und träumen die Menschen viel
Von bessern künftigen Tagen ;
Nach einem glücklichen, goldenen Ziel
Sieht man sie rennen und jagen.
Die Welt wird alt und wird wieder jung,
Doch der Mensch hofft immer Berbes-
serung.

Die Hoffnung führt ihn ins Leben ein,
Sie umflattert den fröhlichen Knaben,

Den Jüngling locket ihr Zauberschein,
Sie wird mit dem Greis nicht begraben ;

Denn beschlieszt er im Grabe den müden
Lauf,
Noch am Grabe pflanzt er -- die Hoffnung
auf.

Es ist kein leerer, schmeichelnder Wahn,
Erzeugt im Gehirne des Thoren.
Im Herzen fundet es laut sich an :

Zu was Besserm sind wir geboren ;
Und was die innere Stimme spricht,

Das täuscht die hoffende Seele nicht,

The Future is Man's immemorial hymn ;
In vain runs the present a-wasting ;
To a golden goal in the distance dim
In life, in death, he is hasting.
The world grows old, and young, and old,
But the ancient story still bears to be
told.

Hope smiles on the Boy from the hour of
his birth :—
To the Youth it gives bliss without
limit ;

It gleams for Old Age as a star on earth,
And the darkness of Death cannot
dim it.

Its rays will gild even fathomless gloom,

When the Pilgrim of Life lies down in
the tomb.

Never deem it a shibboleth phrase of the
crowd,

Never call it the dream of a rhymer ;
The instinct of Nature proclaims it
aloud—

We are destined for something sublimer.
This truth, which the Witness within
reveals,

The purest worshipper deepest feels.

"The problem of the poetical translator," wrote Professor John Stuart Blackie, "is to give, not the words, but the character of the original ; to transfer its spirit, its tone, its salient features, and its rhythmical attitude into another tongue, so far as the capabilities of

that other tongue render such a transference possible." This very accurately describes Mangan's attitude towards those poets from whom he selected for translation into English.

If originality be defined as the power of abstracting for one's self, then many of Mangan's translations, so called, are virtually original poems, because, having seized upon the idea, he expanded and transformed rather than translated. This is especially true of those poems in which he typifies Ireland under various emblematical names—notably "Dark Rosaleen" and "Kathaleen Ny-Houlahan."

The personal element in much of our best poetry lends to it an added charm. It is this, no doubt, which explains the renewed pleasure with which we return to those authors who have given us glimpses of themselves in their works. Mangan has given us many such glimpses, and one or two confessions. That entitled "The Nameless One" is harrowingly autobiographic, and yet is full of such poetic beauty of expression as to draw us to read it again and again. "Twenty Golden Years Ago" is likewise introspective, but in an altogether different strain. In many of his lyrics there is a melody that haunts the ear like the memory of sweet music. Take for example :

"A shepherd sits within a dell
O'er-canopied from rain and heat :
A shallow but pellucid well
Doth ever bubble at his feet.
His pipe is but a leaf,
Yet there, above that stream,
He plays and plays, as in a dream,
One air, that steals away the senses like a thief.

A simple air it seems, in truth,
And who begins will end it soon ;
Yet, when that hidden shepherd youth
So pours it in the ear of noon,
Tears flow from those anear.
All songs of yours and mine
Condensed in one were less divine
Than that sweet air to sing, that sweet, sweet air to hear !

'Twas yesternoon he played it last :
The hummings of a hundred bees
Were in mine ears ; yet, as I passed,
I heard him through the myrtle trees.
Stretched all along he lay
Mid foliage half-decayed ;
His lambs where feeding while he played ;
And sleepily wore on the stilly summer day."

But the mood of song in which he is most often found is that of passionate sorrow, to which he at times gives startling utterance :

"Ah, the joys of love are sweet and false, are sorrows in disguise,
Like the cheating wealth of golden eve, ere night break up the skies.
• If the graves of earth were opened, O if Hades could but speak,
What a world of ruined souls would curse the sheen of beauty's cheek!"

And again :

"O perfidy! In friend or foe,
In stranger, lover, husband, wife,
Thou art the blackest drop of woe
That bubbles in the cup of life."

One mark of a true poet is his imagery. Mangan has many images of singular beauty and felicity; and there is, besides, a warmth, a humanity in his poetry which strikes a responsive chord within us, and which we do not always find in some poets whose work, while admittedly of a high order, has the fatal defect of being cold, and consequently leaves us cold :

"Traverse not the globe for lore! The sternest
But the surest teacher is the heart;
Studying that and that alone, thou learnest
Best and soonest whence and what thou art.

Time, not travel, 'tis which gives us ready
Speech, experience, prudence, tact and wit :
Far more light the lamp that bideth steady
Than the wandering lantern doth emit.

Moor, Chinese, Egyptian, Russian, Roman,
Tread one common downhill path of doom ;
Everywhere the names are man and woman,
Everywhere the old sad sins find room.

Evil angels tempt us in all places.
What but sands or snows has earth to give ?
Dream not, friend, of deserts and oases !
But look inwards and begin to live."

But, perhaps, enough has been quoted to show that his mastery of the metrical and rhythmical resources of the English tongue is undeniably great.

The reader who comes to make a first acquaintance with Mangan's poetry needs to be warned that each of his poems must be judged as we would judge any other work of art—namely, in its entirety. Not one of his poems exists for the sake of any single line. "We have critics," said Matthew Arnold, "who seem to direct their attention merely to detached expressions;" and he adds, "I verily think that the majority of them do not in their hearts believe that there is such a thing as a total impression to be derived from a poem at all, or to be demanded from a poet." One of this class, writing in the London *Athenæum* quite recently, gravely assured us that the crucial test of genius was quotable lines, and in words of

disparagement and cavil dismissed Mangan's claim to recognition. Now this is the very pestilence of modern criticism, and is the outcome of a false conception of the poet's art which would neglect the unity of a poem for the sake of an occasional brilliant line. An almost perfect poem may not have a single quotable line separated from its context, and Mangan has many such poems. We have said "almost perfect" because all human creative effort can but be a striving after the unattainable--after perfection; and the success or failure of our attempts must always be in proportion to the greatness and worthiness of our ideal and the equipment which we bring towards its attainment. "Every one acknowledges," said Pope, "that it would be a wild notion to expect perfection in any work of man; and yet one would think the contrary was taken for granted, by the judgment commonly passed upon poems. A critic supposes he has done his part if he proves a writer to have failed in an expression, or erred in any particular point."

One of the many admirable qualities in Mangan's poetry is its purity. Like his great countryman, Oliver Goldsmith, and the gentle and lovable "Elia," he never wrote a line that dying he would wish to blot. "If the poet be chaste in his manners," Cervantes tells us, "he will be so in his verses; the pen is the tongue of the mind; such as its conceptions are, such will its productions be."

There are signs, apart altogether from the recently published *Life*, that a renewed interest is being felt in Mangan. His fame has been growing steadily during half a century; and although he was much too modest ever to have been guilty of the egotism which prompted Burns to declare that "one hundred years hence they'll think mair o' me than they do now," it is evident that he wrote not for the passing day, for he retouched and polished many of his verses before they assumed their final form, and that is, no doubt, one of the reasons why his poetry gives such pleasure to cultured readers. "I have never yet met," wrote John Mitchel in that memoir to which reference has been made, "I have never yet met a cultivated Irish man or woman, of genuine Irish nature, who did not prize Clarence Mangan above all the poets that their island of song ever nursed."

Cor ad cor loquitur; and so, with the Celtic nature attuned as it is to the finest emotions, Mangan's poetry must ever remain one of our most cherished possessions.

P. A. SILLARD.

INDIVIDUALISM OR COLLECTIVISM?

WHICH WAY DOES EVOLUTION POINT?

“WER reitet so spät durch Nacht und Wind?” Paraphrasing these words of Goethe, a severe critic might ask: “Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass?” For surely, so much has been written, both by the initiated few and the foolish many, on this subject that it has become well-nigh as hackneyed as Hamlet’s famous remark to Horatio anent his philosophy, or Pope’s fallacious dictum that “whatever is, is right.” The writer is not unacquainted with the literature in question, nor is it yesterday that he began to think upon the subject; and, at the risk of irritating his critic and disappointing the long-suffering reader, he would venture to ask forbearance and plead for suspension of judgment until the last sentence is reached. In the meantime the same Goethe provides him with a capital excuse, and even justification, when he says that “Alles Gescheidte ist schon gedacht worden; man muss nur versuchen, es noch einmal zu denken.” To think again what others have already thought, especially in respect to the deep and grave problems which affect our happiness and social progress, surely is a wise injunction. Even if we should fail to arrive at new facts, even if we can suggest no new and far-reaching remedies: by thinking out again and again the same story, by brooding again and again over the same puzzle, the same problem, we at last arrive at a reasoned conviction of the faith that is within us. Nor are, perhaps, the least useful contributions to controversial topics those which do not aim at persuasion, but which simply stimulate the reader’s thought, inducing him to think for himself, to look around him for his own illustrations and proofs. We know the wisdom of the old proverb of persuading a man against his will. Conviction, to be worth anything, must be gradually evolved from within. Nor is dogmatism palatable, from whatever side it may come. We have had too much of this commodity in the past, and can now well and profitably dispense with it. But if, in the manner indicated, we can be suggestive, making the reader, as it were, a kind of partner in our mental pilgrimage, instead of hustling and driving him, we may do a great deal of good in a very humble way towards the elucidation and final solving of the difficult problems

which meet us in all directions. For that reason, too, we shall refrain from giving quotations from recognised authorities. The time has arrived for all of us to think for ourselves, always, and upon all matters; to look life straight and fully and unflinchingly in the face; to allow no one to feed or deceive us with specious phrases and arguments, but to try and arrive at the facts as they are, and to form our own opinions and decide our course of action accordingly, always bearing in mind the splendid lesson taught us by the miller in La Fontaine's fable, who, after various vain attempts to regulate his actions by the opinions of others, finally decided to act on his own, with the happy result *qu'il fit bien*.

Looking, then, for the purposes of this paper, away from all other problems which divide mankind into various and varying groups and classes, we may, broadly speaking, assert that society, or, in Mr. Gladstone's favourite phrase, the civilised world, is at present divided into two camps: in the one we have the individualists, in the other the collectivists. We take these two words in their broad meaning of to-day, so that they require no further explanation. For collectivists we might also say socialists, but as that word is unfortunately not in good odour, we will employ the other and more innocent one. The question, therefore, which the future will have to decide, is as to which of the two rival camps has the greatest social and intellectual claim upon our allegiance—which of the two systems which they represent is best fitted to our new needs, and most likely to bring about that better state of society of which we all more or less dream, and for which the great masses fervently long. However optimistic we may be, we cannot, surely, in these days subscribe to the old Leibnitzian notion that all is working harmoniously and satisfactorily in this preconceived best possible of all worlds, that we all enjoy a proportionately equal share of its joys and its sorrows, its privileges and its drawbacks. Let each one look around in his own town, in his own village, and ask himself the question if there are not many glaring evils and incongruities which require the remedial hand of the reformer; if there are not many undeserved hardships, much unmerited suffering, which require healing; if there is not immense room for improvement in the mental condition of the community before it can be said even to approach the state of a healthy organism. Faithful to our intention, we are not going to particularise these evils here. We wish each one to look around with open eyes, unbiassed, unprejudiced, and to draw up the list for himself. If he cannot do this, he will scarcely be able to follow us in our mental pilgrimage, although we do not at this stage wish to part company with him.

There was a time when it was possible to refer the hard-toiling and suffering part of humanity to a shadowy future—to another world, or another existence, for an *Ausgleich* of the anomalies

existing in this—for a squaring of accounts, so to speak. That was an easy and cheap method on the part of the well-doing classes, among whom the spiritual tutors of mankind have always been prominent, to promote contentment among their toiling, suffering brethren, and thereby secure their own leisure and comfort; and it is, therefore, not to be wondered at that these same classes should regret, and often talk about, the “good old days,” when there were no agitators to unsettle the minds of the people, when they lived happy and contented in their villages, asking Heaven to bless the squire and his relations, and keep them all in their proper stations. We, who are living now amidst different surroundings and under different conditions, cannot, of course, rightly judge in how far the people in those “good old times” were happy, in how far the relationship between the different classes was more satisfactory than it is at present, in how far brotherly love and co-operation made life more noble and desirable. But when we read about those “good old days,” we perceive nothing but dense ignorance, an arrogant priesthood linked with a selfish and often tyrannical aristocracy for the purpose of exploiting the toilers and keeping them in their clutches *à tout prix*. We see persecution stalking through the land, gagging or butchering those who would venture to let in the light of day. The “good old people” may have enjoyed all this—“on ne dispute pas des goûts”—but we, who live in a different psychological climate, can hardly be blamed for not having any ardent longing for the rejuvenescence of those days, for having no particular desire to be roasted before our time. “Cernuntur in agendo virtutes,” says Cicero. The virtues of a man are seen in his actions—and this applies with equal force and correctness to whole historical periods.

A great deal has happened since those “good old days.” The world has awakened from a false position and a false dream. We have been revolutionised. An awakening intelligence, nursed and fostered by science, has brought home to us the conviction that, whatever the next world may be, we have an initial account to settle with *this*—that sufficient unto the day is the evil or the happiness thereof. The toiling millions have arrived at the conviction that they are not merely so many beasts of burden, existing, by the decree of a wise Providence, for the sport of a privileged few, nor so many martyrs destined to thirst and hunger (physically and intellectually) in order to win “golden crowns” and the other paraphernalia promised by their spiritual tutors. This conviction has been hastened and intensified by the fact that, while these self-same tutors were preaching the blessedness of poverty and suffering, they themselves were indulging in all the luxuries of life and doing their utmost to reduce their own suffering to a minimum. And it has not been without a hard, an immensely hard, struggle—still going on to-day—that they have been forced to abandon, at least

partially, their old teaching—have been forced to recognise the fact that those to whom they gave an unguaranteed draft of happiness on a bank beyond their ken had as much right as themselves to claim their share of happiness and comfort in the world they knew and lived in.

Having shaken off the clerical yoke, and with it the clerical superstitions, or at least the selfishly false clerical teaching; having recognised that the dogmas of the various warring creeds are about as essential to his salvation as Nansen's journey to the North-pole, the toiler has begun to look around and to set his *present* house in order, and he has been pushing his birthright with such energy and such persistency that the privileged classes have taken alarm and have thought it wise, for the protection of themselves and their own interests, and in order to stave off what they term "the evil day," to throw various sops to this newly-evolved Cerberus. It is easily understood, however, that the concessions on the part of the privileged and possessing classes are made grudgingly, and sometimes only after a severe struggle and an actual or threatened outbreak on the part of the toilers, which latter, taking advantage of the fact that union means strength, are banding themselves more and more together for the purpose of securing a fairer proportion of the good things of this world and of making their sublunary existence generally more desirable and tolerable. There is an upheaval going on in all civilised countries, an immense struggle between capital and labour, between the employers and the employed, between the possessors and the non-possessors, the "haves and the have-nots." Instead of co-operating, the two forces face each other in a hostile attitude, ready to fly at each other's throats at any time and under any pretext. Is this an ideal or just state of things, and, if not, how can it be altered? We are not as yet in a position to formulate any satisfactory answer. Our picture is not yet complete. But before proceeding with it, let us ask ourselves one little question: Can we, speaking honestly, blame the toilers for joining hands in order to improve the conditions of their lives? Is that not the aim and object of us all and of all our endeavours? And if we are honest and say we *cannot*, we make two *important* admissions: (1) that co-operation for collective improvement is just and wise; and (2) that in the case of these unions at least individualism was played out and a failure, the only prospect of improvement and a happier state of things lying in collectivism, in mutual assistance and co-operation.

And when we turn from these larger concerns to the small traders and the community in general, we still find the same system of competition, the same striving on the part of each unit to obtain the upper hand, the same desire on the part of each man to make his neighbour a stepping-stone towards his own prosperity. This process we euphemistically style "the struggle for life." The vulgar

transcribe it in less elegant but more forcible and realistic language : "Every one for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." And we think it will be generally admitted that in this individualistic struggle, in this system of fierce competition, the "hindmost" are in a very sorry plight, and that in many cases the devil follows close on their heels. And when he has got them we shrug our shoulders with another ready-made euphemism : "Well, que voulez-vous ?—it is nature's law, 'the survival of the fittest.'" "What's Hecuba to him, or he to Hecuba ?"

Now, the question is, are we quite sure that it *is* nature's law ? If we are quite sure, if we can demonstrate it beyond the shadow of a doubt, is it right and wise of us to place barriers in its way, to cripple it and prevent it from fulfilling its purpose ? Is it right for us to build workhouses, to take care of the cripples, the blind, the old, the helpless, the useless—in short, of all those who, from one cause or another, have been incapacitated or come to grief in this "struggle for life" ? If we are in any way logical, there is but one answer : "No." If they are not "fit," nature says let them die. Why should we care ? Are we our brother's keeper ? Then, why do we not act in accordance with that law ? Why do we rather strive to nullify it ? Why have we thus acted *against* nature for already thousands of years, our action becoming ever stronger and more determined as the centuries roll by ? Why are we moved to compassion by the misery and degradation and suffering of our fellow-creatures—by a desire, ever taking a more active form, to remedy the present sad state of things, which desire is now manifesting itself in a strong movement—in which most of the finest and noblest natures are joining—to replace the present system of competition by that of co-operation, to replace the system of selfishness and hatred by that of altruism and love ? On the proper solution of those questions depends to our thinking the answer to the initial query : Individualism or Collectivism ?

It is usually asserted that among plants and the lower animals the struggle for survival is very fierce, and carried on with relentless rigour. But when we descend into nature's workshop and observe her closely we find that this general statement, like most statements of its kind, contains only a half-truth and requires qualifying. We shall find that this "struggle for life" is at its fiercest in her lowest stages, or depths, gradually modifying, as clearer and more perfect types are evolved. In a very interesting and fascinating book *The Sagacity and Morality of Plants*, Dr. J. E. Taylor gives highly instructive examples in that respect, showing that evolution works towards co-operation and altruism, and, what is more, proving that co-operation has invariably worked for the benefit of the individual as well as for that of the community. Speaking of the *Leguminosæ*, he says : "Compare the solitary flowers of the lovely grass pea

(*Lathyrus nissolia*) with the minute but similarly constructed flowers collected to form the heads of the clovers and trefoils. No flowers are perhaps more specialised to the visits of the most intelligent of insects than those of clover; but what would they be if they grew singly? *Co-operation has been the secret of their success, as, indeed, it is of innumerable species in other orders of plants where the same plan has been adopted.* The *Umbelliferae*, *Dipsacae*, and *Compositae* have carried out this idea with the completest success, and with certain modifications of a most suggestive character; some of the members of their floral colonies being altered for the benefit of the community. This alteration has been carried to the extreme point of even sacrificing the individualities of some members for the well-being of the rest." And after giving many more examples of this principle of co-operation and its unvarying success, Dr. Taylor makes this pregnant remark: "Floral altruism is a fact in the vegetable kingdom, only found in the most differentiated floral societies, just as we meet with it only in the highest-developed of humanity, although we anticipate it will be still more developed as mankind grows out of its lower into its higher life."

That the same co-operation exists among animals in innumerable instances is so well known that we should only be burdening our paper with superfluous details by giving cases in point. Let any reader refer to the extremely fascinating experiments made, for instance, by Sir John Lubbock. In the case of the drunken ants, it was only the "foreigners" that met their doom. Although the feeling of international jealousy and hatred is unfortunately still very active among mankind, it must be admitted that we have already considerably advanced on the ants and on our forefathers in that respect.

This sagacity, this altruism, this wonderful co-operation among plants and animals have often tempted the writer—though ever faithful to what he considers the only philosophical position, viz., reverent agnosticism—to the Spinozistic view that there is throughout the boundless universe an all-pervading Reason, manifesting itself in every particle of matter, even in that which appears to us "dead," slowly and gradually evolving from the lowest forms, and reaching its highest development and working-power, as far as with our limited knowledge we can tell, in man, in whom it will continue to develop and to purify itself until this "Sorrowful Star" shall have ceased to be. That would, of course, include the probability, indeed we might say necessity, of this same Reason having found expression and development in other worlds besides our own, which worlds may be able to boast of much more highly evolved beings than ourselves. But this by the way.

Now, what conclusions are we able to draw from our short excursion into the plant and animal kingdoms, which excursion should,

however, be prolonged by each reader at his leisure, so that he may be thoroughly convinced of the facts, and consequently of the correctness of such conclusions? Surely none other than these:

1. That there is a gradual dawning, a gradual manifestation of reason (or reasoning instinct) already distinctly traceable in plant life; and
2. That the struggle for life is fiercest among the lowest forms, gradually softening and modifying as these evolve into higher types, and transforming itself ultimately into altruism and co-operation, both plant and animal life showing many and startling cases in support of this fact.
3. That this co-operation is invariably to the benefit and progress of the community.

The next question which we have to consider in our pilgrimage would be this: Can this gradual and continual modification, this tendency towards altruism and co-operation, be traced forward in man? We think it would be an insult to the reader if we were not to say at once that asking the question is already answering it. Indeed, this tendency towards altruism and collectivism has become so pronounced and unmistakable that Mr. Spencer is quite alarmed and has written very powerfully against it, although he is convinced that he is preaching to deaf ears, and that collectivism will sooner or later become an accomplished fact.

And if all our facts are correct and our reasoning logical, our last and final conclusion from the foregoing would be:

That the law underlying the evolutionary process makes for collectivism, and that there is a deeper significance in the old saying that man is a "social animal" than we have as yet realised.

And this tendency towards collectivism, growing ever stronger as man evolves into higher and higher life, by no means weakens that desire to compete, that love to excel, which nature has so firmly implanted within us, and which is so essential to our advancement that, without it, evolution would, so to speak, come to a standstill. On the contrary, it will remain as powerful as ever, growing still in intensity as men generally become more educated and aspiring; but whereas under existing circumstances it is warped and corrupted and leads to selfishness and selfish ends, under a different and more noble environment and condition of things it will blossom out and expand into that purer form which will make this earth somewhat of that "Kingdom of God" of which the great Collectivist of Nazareth, and, before and after him, many other noble souls, have dreamt. Even at the present day we can find it transformed into that purer form in the case of many great souls whose names will readily suggest themselves to every reader. And have we not all a craving to excel, be it in a mental or a physical combat, though

there be no reward of any kind attached to such excellence? Is this desire, this craving, not even now the parent of many a noble deed which has no other reward than that of its own honourable accomplishment? Why, even the thief, who will so skilfully rob us of our watch or purse, will, under other and more favourable circumstances—where this purer craving, or, as we say, his better nature, has an opportunity to manifest—do a noble act, and rescue a drowning child, or perhaps a paralytic old woman from the burning flames. Let each one think this matter over carefully for himself, and he will come to the conclusion that nature will not leave us in the lurch when she has rescued (evolved) us from our present environment and our present conditions and thus reached her grandest and noblest task; but that the love to compete and to excel will ever remain with us, it being, indeed, fundamental to nature's ever-continuing evolving process.

And as little as we shall lose our desire to excel, so little need we apprehend that a general free education will raise us all to the same level. There will be as much difference between us then as there is now. This difference is as necessary to evolution as the desire to excel, and nature has therefore taken great care to endow us differently. Education can only play upon the material which it finds. It cannot create gifts which do not exist, nor alter our natural temperaments and predispositions. But justice will be satisfied, inasmuch as every boy and girl will have the same chance and the same privileges. The genius, the student, the highly endowed will form the aristocracy. *We shall have an aristocracy of the mind, instead of one of the purse.* It will be an aristocracy in accordance with evolution, in accordance with nature's law, fit to assume the highest offices (the offices of honour) and to direct the affairs of the community for the common good. The less-endowed, the less-studious, the less-persevering will then, as now, lag behind, so that we need never fear that there will not be a plentiful supply of hands to fulfil the inferior offices of life. But these offices will be raised, inasmuch as the work will be performed—instead of, as now, by coarse and almost brutal individuals—by people of greater refinement and education. For by raising and educating the workman, you raise and, so to speak, educate his work. The present writer, for instance, would not have the least objection to walk, like Cincinnatus or Burns, behind the plough, or to work in the fields, if such work were generally performed by people of education, with whom in his leisure moments he might discuss some point in philosophy or general literature.

“Labour like this our wants supplies,
And they must stoop who mean to rise,”

as Cowper says. We have it on the authority of Mr. Joseph McCabe

(*vide* his interesting book, *Twelve Years in a Monastery*) that some London monks discussed such problems as Predestination and Neo-Malthusianism over a game of *marbles*, which game was their recreation for months; so that there should be nothing strange in the idea. At present you cannot expect men of education and refinement to "hob-nob" with the coarse and vulgar. It is against nature, which says, "*Qui se ressemble, s'assemble*," and collectivism does not expect it.

We can now understand the apparent antagonism between the two forces at work in our midst. We can, further, understand why it is impossible to carry the individualistic theory to its logical and stern conclusions. In fact, what seemed an incomprehensible puzzle before has now become quite plain. For, while we are still fiercely competing with one another, nature is gradually having her own way, urging us ever on towards collectivism, towards a higher and nobler goal. And, ever faithful to her principle of employing in her process of evolution all the forces at her command, she uses our reason, which she has now so mightily evolved, for the attainment of that very end. For, although if collectivism, from whatever cause or by whatever law, is *bound* to come, it would scarcely seem requisite to harmonise it with our reason, we maintain that such can easily be done. We shall probably meet with no dissent when we say that the proper philosophy of life is to obtain happiness—and we use the word in its broad meaning—in the world in which we move and have our being. Reason, telling us this, also allows us to realise the proper means of obtaining it. Of course, she only speaks to those who have eyes to see and ears to hear. Now Leibnitz, in his *Definitions Ethicæ*, says: "*Quisquis est sapiens, amat omnes*." The wise man loves all mankind. And that, indeed, is the only way to obtain full and true happiness. Happiness is altruistic or collectivistic. It is a fallacy to think that it can be acquired as a mere selfish possession—that we can acquire it objectively, like, for instance, a new domain or a new suit of clothes. The fate of our millionaires is a standing and convincing proof to the contrary. Indeed, we can with the most absolute safety use the paradox that the more we give happiness away—*i.e.*, the more we confer it upon others—the more we acquire it for ourselves. For no one, we will hope, will be deluded into calling happiness the mere transient gratification of this or that sense, a gratification which in many instances is succeeded by absolute disgust. We say without hesitation, and without fear of contradiction, that if we have never done a generous deed, if we have never made, or tried to make, one fellow-being happy, for however short a period, we have never tasted the sweets of true happiness ourselves. The great Nazarene Carpenter was therefore promulgating no law against reason or nature, no law snatched from the skies, but merely indicating the only sure

road to happiness, when he requested us to love our neighbour as ourself.

We are also now in a position to realise the fallacy contained in such unfortunate books as *Social Evolution* (by Mr. Benjamin Kidd) and their kindred. What shall we say of a writer, calling himself an evolutionist, who does not scruple to speak of altruism as a "new" force which was "born" into the world with the Christian religion? If such writers would only study plant and animal life they would not publish such misleading books. They would realise that altruism and co-operation have nothing to do with the religious instinct, although they *may* be fostered by it, but that they are the working forces of evolution, already traceable deep down in nature, and gradually but securely evolving from among her lowest children. They would realise that reason must ever remain our supreme guide and counsellor, always on the alert, always ready in assisting nature, as she wishes us to do, in directing evolution into the proper channel. History might teach them that mere sentiment may be a good horse, but is an extremely dangerous rider, and that it is absolutely necessary that it should ever be directed by the strong hand of reason. And even without descending to plant and animal life, even without a knowledge of that great revelation which they have in store for the inquirer, if these writers would but study the history of their own species more closely they would find that altruism was in the world long before Christianity was ever thought of, that we are indebted to Confucius for the "golden rule," and to his contemporary Lao-tse for the enunciation of that greater maxim, that good should be returned for injury or evil, as evil would thereby be overcome. They would find that the Christian religion is nothing new or final, but, like all other faiths and philosophies, merely a phase in the grand evolutionary process; that it assimilated the great thoughts afloat, drawn largely from Greek and Roman wisdom, but with them, unfortunately, also the current errors and superstitions; that it is itself in a perpetual state of flux, being subject, like everything else, to the evolutionary law, and that it is ever being purified from its false accretions by the tender care of reason. They would find that altruism, instead of being extra-rational, is thoroughly in harmony with our reason, thoroughly in harmony with the end towards which evolution is leading us, and that it is sheer ignorance to say that it is the product of any distinct period or any particular religious system. Greek and Roman writers would emphasize to them their error. They might, for instance, read that Cicero said of Rabirius Postumus: "In his anxiety to increase his fortune, it was evident that it was not the gratification of avarice that was sought, *but the means of doing good.*" And there were as yet no Christians in the days of Cicero.

And when such writers refer us to the ancient Greeks, and ask why with all their intellectual advancement they did not arrive at

such a state of altruistic or collectivistic development as we witness in these days, our answer is this: (1) Their civilisation was within very narrow territorial limits, with an extremely scanty population, in which the altruistic or collectivistic instinct had not by any means the same chance of development as it has under the totally different conditions under which we live to-day, with our crowded cities and their half-starved inhabitants. (2) It was based on militarism with all its evil and retarding influences, of which we recently had a striking example in the Zola trial. (3) Art and poetry do not by any means constitute the limit of man's intellect and advance. They do not make the whole man. (4) Since those days we have advanced in other fields, notably in science. Science has not only revealed to us our place in nature, but also our place and duty towards each other, and it is noteworthy how the spread of toleration and altruism and the call for collectivism have been commensurate with the advance in science, with a greater and more intimate knowledge of nature and of ourselves. Where were this toleration and altruism, say, in the Middle Ages, when religion was at the zenith of her power, and her influence the greatest? Where was even the sacredness of life and honour? (5) We have a peculiar veneration for the "long ago," which leads us to exaggerate its merits and to minimise present achievements. It is the peculiar complaint of each era that the world has lost her splendour, and that her great men are no more. If the ancient Greeks could behold these present times, with all their startling wonders of our inventive genius, with their far-reaching scientific discoveries, we feel very sure they would not place their civilisation above ours, but rather consider ours head and shoulders above theirs. (6) To form a correct judgment we have to bear in mind not a certain set, but all and every condition of the two periods which we wish to compare.

Our task is now practically finished, and it remains for each one to supply his own answer to our initial query. Based on the facts which we are afraid we have but all too feebly stated—it would almost require the writing of a book to do them full justice—our own conviction is that *evolution makes for collectivism*. We believe that this collectivism, instead of being feared, should be welcomed. It will not come about by violent means—such means would rather be instrumental in retarding it—but travel along the slow path which is evolution's own. Its advent will be gradual, one advance post falling at a time, and it will be in possession of the whole field before mankind is well aware of its arrival. It will *not* be what all the lazy and good-for-nothings of to-day wish and intend it to be, nor what its opponents fear it to be. Under its beneficent sway there will be no cause for jealousy, hatred, malice, oppression, despotism, and all the evil passions which our present system fosters. The love of country, or patriotism—which, analysed, is but the col-

lective pride and greed and selfishness of a tribe or nation—will be transformed into the love of mankind and tenderness to our animal kindred. Even the present day is pregnant with important signs to that effect, signs the meaning of which to a far-seeing eye is unmistakable. It will evolve human nature to a perfection which we can at present but dimly conceive, inasmuch as it will give scope for the development of our better qualities only. Man will nobly compete with man for the benefit and happiness of all. Art, science, and literature will flourish more brightly than ever, and be accessible and a joy to the whole community. No emaciated faces, no half-dressed, starving children, no vengeful looks and scowling eyes will meet us at the street corners. Labour will be ennobled, and it will be a pleasure to work and to live. And when the world has grown bright and happy under its beneficent sway, people will look back upon these days of misery, and hatred, and jealousy, and general oppression and corruption with astonishment and sadness, and, while the pitying tear falls from their eye, their feeling will crystallise in the sigh: "O ye of little understanding and of little faith!"

And if we should be asked what part religion will play in those distant days, our unhesitating answer would be that the present superstitions, including Roman Catholicism and Protestantism, will have died away, but that, though religions may have died, Religion will still remain. But her speculations will be modest, and in conformity with reason and science. The false Christian philosophy of to-day will have been cleared away. Its dogmas, which even now are standing in the way of progress and enlightenment, and retarding the advent of the happier days, will have disappeared. But let not the Christian be disheartened. Let him rather rejoice, for, instead of losing, man will have gained in reverence for the Great Unknown. The Mighty Secret will appeal to his mind and his imagination in a more reverent manner than now. But, what is of more importance, the "Sermon on the Mount" will not have been preached in vain, for its precepts, so conveniently ignored in our days, will then be in full practice.

Such, then, is our faith. Justice to all mankind, the same privileges, the same chance for every creature born. No tyranny, no oppression. The watchword—labour, and laziness a crime. The motto—the noble one supplied many years ago by Tom Paine: "The world is my country, and to do good is my religion."

R. DIDDEN.

'POETRY, POETS, AND POETICAL POWERS.

"POET" is a word which naturally reminds us of the names of Kalidās and Bhababhūti, Shakespeare and Milton, Goethe and Schiller, names dearer to us than anything we have ever known. Each one of these names instils in us a feeling of unalloyed love and affection for the great masters of poetry. We forget the thousands of miles that lie between our birthplace and theirs. We forget the centuries that stand in the way of our direct and palpable touch with them. No traces are to be found of the ages when these dear children of God came to us with their divine messages—for God's message comes to the world only through two sources, the pen of the poet and the mouth of the prophet—all have been submerged in the span of that great enemy of man called Time which divides us from them; but their names are a living memory; they stand before us delivering their heavenly message. Why is all this? That is a question which comes naturally to the mind of every lover of art, poetry, and literature. None of us have seen these great masters, the most perfect specimens of human genius. We should all give anything to see them. But how many of us should care to see that Kalidās who was striking with his axe on the root of that branch upon which he was sitting, or that Shakespeare whose early genius was discerned in his skill as a deer-stealer? It is not that Kalidās, neither is it that Shakespeare, of whom we are enamoured. The Kalidās who stealthily saw the first bloom of love in the heart of the lovely, simple-hearted girl Sakuntala; who made Sakuntala establish a relationship with a roe by adopting it as her child; who witnessed her take the dust off the eyes of her future lord with her lips; who in the thick of the forest saw and felt for the love pangs of young Sakuntala's heart, and gave her his sympathy—it is that Kalidās whom we long to see. It is that Shakespeare, to see whom we should give all our possessions of this mundane world, who bore witness to the sufferings of disappointment of young Hamlet—a prince indeed, and a prince of men; who witnessed the cruel assassination of guileless and loving Desdemona by Othello; who amply congratulated himself on having been able to mete out a condign punishment to the unfaithful, treacherous Lady Macbeth;

who made Miranda confess that her ambition was humble because she had loved Ferdinand, the third person "she ever saw, and the first one she sighed for."

Speaking plainly, it is his poetry that makes the name of the poet a dear one to us. If I am asked the question, What is poetry? I should say, "Tell me what is not poetry, and I will tell you what it is." It is easier to tell what poetry is when we know what it is not.

I will now attempt to make out what is not poetry. Byron has told us,

"Freedom's battle once begun,
Bequeathed by bleeding sire to son,
Though baffled oft, is ever won,"

and it is truly said that genuine poetical powers are discernible in these three lines. The question will be asked, What is that in these three lines which is poetry? They have rhyme; it is clear that the poet thinks slavery to be an undesirable bondage—a curse; the poet's love of freedom is also plain. Which one of the three things that we see in the lines is poetry? If a verse, simply for the sake of its rhyme and melody, comes to be recognised as poetry, I am afraid our great masters, Shakespeare and Milton, would have to rest contented with the appellation of mere versifiers or poetasters, and would have to retire from the contest to make room for some divine Muse like our present Poet-Laureate or the poet of Asia and of the World. We often call these advertisements, in perhaps unblemished rhyme, poetry, and more often their writers poets. Even sublime thoughts only are not poetry. If they were so, certainly Bacon and Spenser, Voltaire and Rousseau, Carlyle and Emerson should be among the great poets of the world, or the following lines of J. Q. Adams should make him a great poet:

"This hand, to tyrants ever sworn the foe,
For freedom only deals the deadly blow;
Then sheathes in calm repose the vengeful blade,
For gentle peace in Freedom's hallowed shade."

Adams's appreciation of freedom does not fall far short of Byron's, but that is a very poor reason why the former's four lines must be deemed as highly poetic as the three of the latter. It is difficult to establish a man's poetic powers even when in his verses there is a remarkable combination of perfect rhyme, melodious versification, high thoughts, and regular figures. Many of my readers will disagree with me, and call it a fine piece of poetry where they find the presence of all these characteristics. I do not venture to say that the presence of these features is not material to the making up of poetry, but that we always lose sight of the chief essence of poetry,

preferring the less essential ones, and this chief essence is what we call "emotions or passions." I shall be asked why is it that I prefer to call Byron's lines real poetry, and not those of Adams? What is present in Byron's three lines which is absent in the lines of Adams? There is rhyme in both. But there is one feature—a grand transcendental feature—in Byron's which we fail to find in Adams's. And that is Byron's emotion, his love of freedom. This love of freedom is not his opinion; it is not a scientifically proven truth to him; it is not a discovery: it is his passion. The strength of this passion is a clear evidence of his high poetic powers. Without this passion his lines are dry and insipid, anything but poetry. Every one of us has noticed on various occasions that the awakening of passionate eloquence of a true orator simultaneously awakens the emotions and passions in the minds of his audience. John Stuart Mill, that great connoisseur of human character, observed this very clearly. The great scholars and critics of ancient Sanskrit literature have also said that this passion is the real test of poetry. "*Bākyaṃ Rasātmakam Kāvyaṃ*" (Passionate words are poetry). Poetry is a combination of thought with emotion. Poetry has, indeed, nothing to do beyond what I call emotion or passion. It is no business of poetry to lead us to a new system of thought; let science and philosophy do that; poetry undertakes to kindle in us new sentiments and new emotions as well as the dormant passions.

When we keep these characteristics of poetry clearly before us, to single out true and genuine poetry becomes easier. A study of what does not awaken in us a feeling of emotion is no more poetry than Euclid's definition of a point or of an acute angle. The elegiac verse that fails to inspire in us a sense of affection and a feeling of deep sorrow is a poetry not worth the name. The lyric that cannot make us offer our deepest sympathy to the individual emotions of the poet is nothing short of versification. We have not unfrequently heard many a man of culture talk glibly about an author of some prose work being the happy possessor of poetic gifts, simply because, as it happens, it is impossible to make any improvement upon the beauty of his narrative. I have a serious quarrel with them. I fail to see why poetic powers must be necessary for arranging a story in prose or perfecting a narrative! Intelligence and imagination are all that is needful. Novels of this description are not poetry because they are mere narrative compositions, and as such are no part of what I call the emotions or passions of poetry. John Stuart Mill has told us that the period of our life, childhood, when the eagerness to hear stories and fables is most keen, is the period when our faculty to appreciate poetry is least developed. *Æsop's Fables, Tales from the Arabian Nights, Fairy Tales, Robinson Crusoe, and Adventures of Don Quixote* are the poetry of our childhood. Then we appreciate them more than Milton's "*Lycidas*"

or Tennyson's "In Memoriam," Shelley's "Skylark" or Gray's "Elegy."

There is a popular belief that it is in childhood that we can study poetry with the greatest profit, because, as is said, it is then that we receive impressions quickest; and a study cannot fail to leave a deep and lasting impression upon us even though we may not appreciate it—as a matter of fact we do not. This is a wholly contradictory and erroneous belief. It seems difficult to understand how a study that has not been enjoyed because not appreciated can leave an impression upon any person. Impression without appreciation is a contradiction. It is erroneous also because in childhood the first bud of those feelings and emotions upon which alone poetry plays is yet unborn, much less taken shape. There are others who believe that a true poet must be gifted with the power of studying human nature, manners and customs, closely and accurately. This appears to be hardly anything like the qualification or a gift which the true poet must possess. Professor Edward was an admittedly great philosopher even though he could not tell his own horse from those of his friends. In like manner, it is perfectly reasonable that one completely ignorant of human nature, manners and customs, can be a poet too. Indeed, when I recall the fact that most poets have been utterly indifferent to human nature, human manners, and human desires, if not complete ascetics in regard to them. I might say without fear of contradiction that the exactly opposite view is nearer the truth. A knowledge of human nature is a qualification needful for the novelist, whose real art it is to paint truly human character, act and deed, whose real skill is in being able to describe graphically the feelings of others. Very different is the function of the poet. The novelist gives us a true picture of others besides himself, whereas the poet presents us with a picture of the waves and emotions of his own heart. For lack of incidents, which in his hands take the shape of a plot, the novelist is resourceless. But the poet cares no more for those indispensable materials of the novelist than he does for opinions opposed to the dictates of his imagination. He takes a handful of sawdust and makes a present of it to us a lump of gold. A formidably dark and gloomy night, an uninhabited desert or a thick forest, a solitary dilapidated castle or a superb palace, in them an exquisitely beautiful woman with all the charms and virtues that is in the power of the Almighty to bestow upon a dear child of His, these are some of the materials without which the novelist is ill at ease, without which his imagination cannot play, without which the sentimental feelings of the novel reader cannot be awakened. But the mere sight of the new cloud was the cause of an overflow of sentiments and passionate emotions of Kalidas such as the world has never seen before or since. As a ploughman when tilling the land, the mere destruction

of an ant-hill drove Burns mad with rambling thoughts, and these are what richly adorn some of the pages of true poetry. The mere sight of a lark caused Shelley to give us what all the novelists put together could not give. Descriptive verse is truly poetry when surcharged with emotions. The mere fact of a description being put in verse has perhaps the poorest claim to be poetry.

There are, again, some who believe that drama is poetry and the dramatist is a poet. It is difficult to believe that this is so. There must be an equipoise of narration and emotion in a drama. Mill said that the presence of a consummate narrative skill with an abundance of heart's feelings and passions in his dramas is what has made Shakespeare a most perfect poet, what has made us value his works so highly, is what has made them so dear to us. Take any of Shakespeare's great tragedies, and you see how the narrative becomes thicker and thicker as you read scene after scene and act after act, until it comes to that when every event sends a thrill in your heart, when its awakening influence is felt to be so powerful that our emotions cannot remain any longer dormant; and our awakened passions now make us weep with sorrow and sympathy, and now rage with passionate fury.

The question—Why should not an orator be regarded as a poet in the light of the test of the true poet and manifestations of poetry laid down here?—is not an unnatural one, looking to the fact that he too expresses the emotions, waves, and thoughts of his own mind, and what is more, kindles the passions and awakens the emotional thoughts of his hundreds and thousands of audience. What may then be the distinction between poetry and oratory? Nobody has ever uttered a truer word about poetry than John Stuart Mill, when he said that "oratory is heard, but poetry is overheard." The meaning suggested in this sentence is clear. When the orator speaks, he begins with a consciousness of the presence of others before him, with a consciousness that he is speaking to them; but the poet, when beginning to write, is oblivious of the existence of any one in this world other than himself, he forgets that this world is peopled by anybody else. The orator takes pains to awaken and kindle the feelings in others by his eloquence, while the poet is anxious how best to express the thoughts of his own heart, to do which he starts with the idea that they do not concern anybody save himself. The first thought in the mind of the made poet, or one who falsifies the adage "A poet is born, not made," with his pen in his hand, is—how to write, what word to use that would be pleasing to the ear of man, delicious to his taste, enjoyable and delightful? and hence goes in quest of choice and suitable words, with the result that he partly succeeds in making his rhyme a soft and a tender one, but nothing more. The true poet is above all these troubles and exertions. He has no patience for it. All he attempts to do is to compose in

that style and to use those words which in his opinion would delineate the truest picture of his own heart, by style and diction to make a mirror in which to see the clearest shadow of his own thoughts. Not unfrequently poverty of language prevents his passions from finding their fullest expression. But the thought which is distinct, which is clear, gives us a clue to the sublimity of a whole series of them that are not properly expressed. This is one of the many reasons why the composition of the true poet is more life-giving and exquisite, because he is able to express some of his thoughts clearly, and with regard to the rest is incapable of doing more than throwing a hint for us to find out what the whole is, just as a few strokes of the brush of the great artist give us an idea of how lovely and natural the picture would look when finished. .

I have in the foregoing pages attempted to ascertain what poetry is. Now we shall try to find out who the poet is. This does not appear to be a task at all difficult. The test of poetry is to all intents and purposes the test of the poet. If emotional words are poetry, undeniably then the composer, or one who is capable of composing those emotional words, is the poet. That is to say, one whose composition is pregnant with ardent and intense feelings of the heart, and a study of whose composition awakens in the reader all his stagnant and motionless passions, is the poet. It is difficult to disagree with Mill when he says that a poet, the study of whose poetry leaves us in doubt whether or not he is a true poet, is in all probability not one.

It is a common belief that God has endowed certain persons with certain powers by which they are able to compose really good poetry. Nobody seems to have ever inquired into what these powers are or how they work. These powers are commonly called "poetic powers." It is said, "A poet is born, and no power on earth can deprive him of his gifts: one who is not a poet is not born so, and no amount of exertion can make him one." This is a very serious question. Those who do not admit the possibility of acquiring a second nature by habituating oneself to something, may ask that, placed under similar circumstances and training, why should it not be possible for every one of us to be a Shakespeare or a Kalidas? In a later part of this paper I shall make an attempt to decide the question. At present I shall draw the attention of the reader to two things. We have known persons eager for a poetic fame. Their one and only subject of conversation is poetry, poetic powers, merits and demerits of a poet, and so on; their delight is to compose poems, and, if favoured by fortune's smiles, they do not hesitate at all to publish their poems in book form. It is indeed a pity that none save themselves are found to appreciate their writings, and the real genius of their own powers is discerned by themselves only. Again, we have known persons who write poems occasionally, very occa-

sionally, and sometimes it is a most annoying task to make them write one, and these have never been known to have given anything but the most blissful delight to their readers. The excellence of their thoughts and the beauty of their rhyme could not have failed to impress upon them. This certainly tends to support the theory that a "poet is born." On the other hand, we have known persons who at one period of their life showed no poetic powers so called, but have done so at a later one, and that of a perfect type. Kalidas is a glorious illustration of this latter theory. It is certainly past the imagination of man that the hand that wrote *Ritusumhara*, *Vikramorvasi*, or *Malavikagnni*, was capable of composing *Sakuntala*, *Meghduta*, or *Kumara*. They are as unlikely the compositions of the same hand as *Malatimadhava* or *Viracharita* as compared to *Uttarama-charita* are those of Bhababhuti's. Both Milton and Cowper stand arm in arm with Kalidas and Bhababhuti. Of Milton it is said by one of his critics that he "was not a genius, 'a boy poet' of the type of Chatterton and Shelley." Another critic of Milton tells us that "he had not even produced school exercises of unusual merit." There is an astounding and an unbelievable difference in style, in thought, in true poetic genius, between what they wrote when they were a few years over their teens and what they composed twenty years later. As will appear, this supports the latter view. I am aware some of the readers of this paper will hold the former opinion and others the latter. My own opinion is that both the theories have a great deal of truth in them, and both are reasonable, inasmuch as there truly is to be found a gift which we call "poetic gift," and that circumstances, and training too, have much to do with the development or curtailment of that gift.


I have tried to prove before that without emotions of the heart it is not poetry, and that without them poetic powers are absent in the writer of verse. Some may ask whether the mother of a dead child, when she wails and weeps over her loss—when there is no paucity of emotions or lack of feelings of the heart in her, when her troubles not only excite the deepest sympathy with her of all those who hear about it, but make them feel the loss as keenly as the mother herself—whether that mother is a poet and her wailings and her troubles that foment our passions are poetry? I am disposed to say they are not poetry, neither is she a poet, since the cause of her sorrow is utterly devoid of any imagination, and is only a palpable event and a loss, though the most serious one that human being can suffer from. It is a loss which is equally grievous to every one of us. Her sorrows and troubles are exactly what we should feel when placed in a similar situation. But the poet's imagination, tempered by his individual passions and thoughts, is otherwise. It is his imagination that creates the beauty of his poetry. The conclusion, therefore, that merely passions or emotions

of the heart are not poetic powers cannot be helped. Imagination is undoubtedly one of the chief features of poetic gifts; and not only imagination, but in the inmost depth of the poet's heart we find another feature so powerfully predominant that it cannot be ignored. It is the association of ideas. As various dreamy sights pass away before the eyes of a delirious patient, so it is by the miraculously divine power of the association of ideas that the poet in an instant sees before his mind's eye various events and feels multifarious emotion and a medley of thoughts. In the true genuine poet are visible the three most powerful characteristics—emotions, imagination, and association of ideas. To put it in order, at the idea of a certain thing inspiration dawns upon the poet, his imagination then clothes his inspiration with fashion of his own choice. The poet then forgets himself, he loses his self-consciousness, and is nothing but a lump of inspiration and imagination. If it is the deed of a hero that arrests his attention or commands his admiration, he becomes the hero himself, unconscious of his own individuality, unconscious of all things around him. Sometimes he marches on with his hero, at others he takes the tragic leave of her whom he considers to be nearer than the dearest thing could be, whom he holds dearer than even his own life. Thus his imagination sometimes becomes so overpowering, so vivid, that he can almost follow each footstep of his hero. With the brush of inspiration and the colour of imagination he paints a most faithful picture of the passions of his heart and the association of his ideas. His new ideas are associated by old ones. He does not think of them. They come to him of themselves with magic precision and faithfulness. This faculty or power is the association of ideas which enriches the poet's composition with similes that add force and strength to his own emotions.


Thus, when inspiration, imagination, and association of ideas come to him, the poet takes himself away from the ordinary vocations, bustles, and anxieties of life, and he holds his pen. Now he tries to choose his words—choose only those words which he thinks would be exactly expressive of what he means and would accurately represent the passions of his heart. His ability to do it calls forth our admiration of his choice of words. When he has done this he invites his faculty of harmony to help him to spinning these his chosen words into rhyme. Finally, if the poet is a man of refined tastes he is able to sort out emotional feelings from inspired thoughts, and puts them in their proper place to prevent a hopeless *abracadabra* marring the beauty and excellence of true poetry. All these faculties are certainly the natural possessions of a born poet, and the presence and co-existence of all of them in a person is what we call "poetic powers." One, the trend of whose mental constitution is not towards these, can no more be a poet than Shelley could be a physicist. They are better known as prosaic men—men whose

emotions are domineered over by their reason and imaginations subordinated by facts.


There are two classes of poets even among those who are admitted on all hands to be poets, in most of whom we find all the faculties I have mentioned present, and whose works are acknowledged as true poetry. One is natural or born poet, the other is made poet. All the difference that there is between them is that inspiration comes first to the born poet and imagination and association of ideas next, only to thicken his inspiration; whereas the made poet inspires himself with the help of imagination and association. I shall attempt to show what I mean by a genealogical tree. If we take the cause to be origin of true poetry, the tree may be drawn as follows:



When we take the effect to be cause of true poetry, the tree is slightly altered in manner, but in matter it remains the same:



As regards his diction and rhyme, too, I shall attempt to draw another tree to make myself clearly understood.



It is thus that we have chaste and animating diction and faultless rhyme in the born poet:

¹ Creation of beauty and brilliancy of description.

In the made poet the order would be very much different from the born :

1. Imagination.
2. Association of ideas.
3. Inspiration.

Regarding diction and rhyme, the made poet can very well say to the born that his method is not dissimilar to his, and in that he stands on a par with him. To put it more explicitly and in fewer words, it might be that the born poet loses his individuality in inspiration, while the made poet has got to invoke inspiration. One might say it is quite possible for the made poet to lose like the born poet his individuality in the inspiration after invocation. Verily so. But inspiration is the domineering mistress of the natural or born poet—she fascinates the poet simultaneously with the awakening of his emotions, and who, as an unwilling guest of the made poet, cannot have that influence over him which she always has over her dearer lord. In the case of the former, his cup of passion is always warm and full to overflowing ; in that of the latter, he has got to warm it full to the brim. The verse of the one is thoughtful emotions, that of the other is emotional thoughts ; or rather, as Mill has said, that one sees and describes in poetry, the other sees in prose and describes in poetry. One has a natural irrepressible fountain of emotion ; the other has, with the aid of a pressure below, to show that his is a fountain too. The one makes use of the figures, similes, or thoughts that come across his emotions at the moment, else he loses sight of them ; he has no time, neither patience nor inclination, to go in quest of any of them ; the other is always, at every step, on the look-out for them, and invites them. His anxiety is to see his figures regular, his illustrations consistent, his feelings accepted as true.

Persons who are commonly called poets are certainly divided into two classes I have described. Of modern English poets, I take Burns, Byron, Shelley, Keats, and Swinburne to be natural or born poets, and Wordsworth, Southey, and Tennyson to be made poets. By way of illustration, I have classified the modern poets in a way which, I am afraid, might be taken serious objection to by many of my readers, who, I daresay, have a different opinion of them from what I have. So long as there is emotion, so long as there is passion, there is feeling of heart in the natural poet, there is that simplicity of his diction, that brilliancy of his description and regularity of his figures. It is on this account that he is seldom successful in describing a subject covering a very long period. As a rule, he is a much more brilliant success when he writes short pieces on solitary subjects ; here his composition is excellent, his performance glorious and life-giving. The made poet may be able to write poems at request, or, to put it in a more expressive but

undignified phrase, may be able to compose poems to order, and there is a possibility, even probability, of their being very good; but the *born* poet is a huge failure when trying to make poems to order. He has to wait for inspiration to dawn upon him.

I might notice here that men with not more than two or three of the six qualities I have mentioned (inspiration, imagination, association of ideas, association between words and sentiments, faculty of harmony, and taste) have been reckoned among the poets. Men utterly devoid of the first three qualities, but richly possessing the last three, are commonly and widely known to be poets. I should be slow to call them by so supreme an appellation.

There is another question, an attempt to decide which might be made before I conclude: Whether circumstances and training help in the amelioration or in the deterioration of poetic powers? I cannot think of a more appropriate answer to the question than that when the poet's powers have only to do with his emotions they must suffer, either for better or for worse, according as the warmth or chilliness of the passions of his heart. In every-day life we see domestic troubles and anxieties, physical malady, painful sorrows, and various other causes have an irresistible effect upon the feelings or emotions of a man. If the poet passes through all these stages of severe mental agitation, it is no wonder, nay, it is only natural, that his poetic abilities should suffer because of the decrepitude which these ailments cannot fail to bring upon the emotional side of his nature. There is, again, an improvement in his poetical abilities when his mental constitution becomes healthier, and there is a marked deterioration in his powers with the weakening of the same constitution. Materialism, or the materialistic ideas of the age, are the deadliest enemy to poetry, poets, and their gifts. Materialism arrogantly and audaciously puts down emotions and sentimentalism as a sign of weakness utterly unworthy of man. To love deeply, to be devotedly fond and affectionate of a person is, say the materialists, the sign of a fevered and delirious brain, and not that of the man of reason. To shed tears for the sorrows of others becomes, they say, a woman, not a man. To feel sympathy for the suffering humanity ill suits a man of the world—a man of action, who, according to Goethe, “is conscienceless,” as Mr. John Morley beautifully puts it in his recent Romanes lecture. This mischievous theory of materialism is not only injurious but damaging to the art and literature of poetry, and therefore to the finer nature of man. It is a deplorable fact that even those who are gifted by nature with poetic abilities, with a heart full of love, sympathy, and passionate emotions, are disgracefully trying their very best to suppress these feelings, to be carried away by them under the magic influence of materialism. Auguste Comte exhausted his unparalleled argumentative faculty and his vocabulary to put a check to the growth of this

dangerous theory of materialism. It is undeniable that that theory which belittles the qualities of the heart and magnifies those of the brain is a dangerous one. Where on earth do we find a sweet repose from the turmoils, anguish, sorrow, and pains of life? Is it the head or the heart? Who can deny that it is the heart—that heart is the place of that blissful repose? Make man heartless, he is no other than a brute. John S. Mill, after serious thought, came to the conclusion that this material world is nothing but a “permanent possibility of sensation.” But is that any reason why man—the young man—should bid adieu to the noble goddess of his affectionate fondness, the goddess of the feelings of his heart, as the “permanent possibility of sensation”? With Campbell he will in an unmistakable voice say :

“I ask not proud philosophy
To teach me what thou art.”

There are two ways by which poetical powers could be improved. One is to study abundantly, over and over again, the writings of natural and born poets. This has a doubly beneficial effect upon us. First, the various feelings of our heart are awakened, dormant passions become fresher, and new emotions are infused. Secondly, that most important faculty of the choice of words is developed, with a large vocabulary at our command, simultaneously with the growth of the faculty of harmony (rhyme), and refinement of taste becomes distinctly visible. The other way is the association of women. To many, I am sure, this is a novel suggestion. Especially at this stage of our civilisation, and looking to the lamentable state of our relationship with intelligent women, it is difficult to put as innocent a construction upon it as I mean. Some may ridicule the bare possibility, for the close connection of the pure heart of woman with that of the pure man is what this generation of mankind cannot yet realise. Commonly speaking, intelligent feminine company means something unspeakable, something unholy; but let my meaning be clearly understood. What it is to love a pure woman as a friend and to have that love reciprocated is past the description of human intellect—nay, past all conception of human imagination. Perhaps, of all persons, Shelley was the one, and only one, destined to realise it when addressing to Emily Viviani :

“Would we two had been twins of the same mother,

* * * * *

We—are we not formed, as notes of music are,
For one another, though dissimilar?”

This is a feeling transcendental indeed. Auguste Comte realised that feeling, and that is why he devoted his whole intellect, energy, and life towards placing the woman on the highest pedestal—a

pedestal even higher than the one which his God must occupy. The ancient Hindus deified the woman. Their Goddess of Fortune, Goddess of Learning, in fact, all their most powerful deities, were women. This is symbolical of a significant idea. Comte, following the Hindus, tried to deify the woman. A distinguished professor of Cambridge on one occasion spoke about the woman as "the princess." "She is the sleeping princess; the prince will have to come and wake her up." This is an exquisite idea. That the mere look in the most innocent sense of the woman inspires us with poetic thoughts cannot be denied, and this the ancient sages of the Hindus and of the Greeks saw vividly. This is exactly the re-echo of my sentiments about women. Those who are incapable of looking at the face of the woman with pure eyes are frivolous. One can only pity and commiserate them. To advise them would be a sheer waste of energy. My remarks are only meant for those who are capable of looking upon the woman as their goddess in life and those who are capable of seeing the holy sanctified halo round her face.

JUDITH.

IDEALS OF FRIENDSHIP.

THE sentiment of friendship has little currency to-day. Other sentiments, more powerful, or for some other reason better adapted to modern circumstances, have moulded modern character. The enthusiasm of humanity, love of knowledge, the ambition of material progress seem so much more stimulating and far-reaching motives, that it is difficult to believe that there was ever any efficacy in so faint and negative a sentiment as friendship. Yet there have been periods in the life of the world when this sentiment was an active force, like in kind, if not in degree, to religion or patriotism or the enthusiasm of humanity.

There are three periods in the world's history in which the idea of friendship has been especially an elevated and a fruitful idea. There is the idea of Ancient Greece, in the period between the rise of the Persian War and the intrusion of Philip of Macedon into Greek politics; an idea made palpable to us in the circle about Socrates, and in the pair of friends, Pelopidas and Epaminondas. There is the idea of the Renaissance, most evident in the lives of Sir Philip Sidney and Fulke Greville, and of Montaigne and La Boétie. There is, finally, the idea, somewhat isolated and ineffectual, of the Swift *colerie*, in the early years of the eighteenth century.

The idea of Ancient Greece and the idea of the Renaissance are nearly akin in the passion which elevates both, their immediate connection with a sense of beauty, and their transcendental character. The idea of the eighteenth century is more purely intellectual, lacking the penetrative energy given by emotion, but broad, clear-sighted, of great utility.

In some of his most beautiful dialogues, in the *Lysis*, the *Phaedrus*, and the *Banquet*, Plato has looked at this idea, turning it about to catch different lights, like a diamond of many facets. In the *Banquet* it is love that is discussed by name, but the questions, which in the *Lysis* are put to a pair of friends to bring them to a consciousness of the nature of friendship, are answered here, for the Greeks had a keen appreciation of the sentiment of friendship, and only a faint appreciation of the sentiment of love, so that sometimes they made love tributary to friendship, and sometimes they ignored their dividing limits.

"Love," says Socrates, in the *Banquet*, professing to repeat the instructions of Diotima, a wise woman of Mantinea, "love is of the beautiful; it desires the eternal possession of the beautiful, and the beautiful is the same as the good." Now, the desire of immortality is most nearly attained through creation, and the character of the creation is determined by the character of the mortal man who desires immortality. There is the ordinary man who can only arrive at such a measure of immortality as is implied in the continuation of his family. That is the extent of his creative power. There is the warrior-hero, like Achilles or Odysseus, whose immortality consists in dwelling in men's memory. That is a higher kind of immortality. And there is the immortality of the poet, which is perhaps more noble than that of the warrior, and is won by no contemptible faculty of creation. But a truer, deeper immortality than the immortality of the father, the poet, or the warrior will reward the man who has the instinct of friendship; an instinct which prompts to creation in the mind of another, and its offspring is not a family, nor glory, nor brilliant creatures of imagination, but virtue. The happy possessor of this gift will inevitably be captivated at first with the beauty of outward form, for it is the inevitable attraction of beauty that first sets him upon his upward course. But he will not remain long here. He will soon be led to consider that "the beauty of the mind is more honourable than the beauty of the outward form. So that if a virtuous soul be hidden in a body of but little comeliness, he will be content to love and tend him, and will search out and bring to the birth thoughts which build up the soul, until his friend is compelled to contemplate and see the beauty of institutions and laws, and understand that all kinds of beauty and of the good are but phases of the Eternal Beauty, and that personal beauty is only a trifle."

Plato thus connects the impulse to friendship with all those desires which reach out beyond themselves, groping for something of which they have only had a disquieting presentiment, a faint prophetic intimation—the desire of the lover, the desire for fame, the vision of the mystic, the "incommunicable dream" of the poet and the artist, and of many a man who is neither, and yet yearns with a kind of home-sickness for something which the eye of man has not seen.

Friendship was to Plato the happy means of reconciliation between that feeling for beauty which was the essential condition of his physical life, and that imperious necessity—the essential condition of his intellectual life—of harmonising and unifying in thought all the modes of his being, passion and thought alike. Friendship was the miracle for him which could transform the intimations of sense into idea, and fuse cold intellectual categories into a passion of virtue. It was characteristic of Plato and partly characteristic of

his time, that the virtue of friendship which he ranked so high derived its birth from the admiration of personal beauty, and finally lost itself in a mystery of Pantheism. But it is the intermediate stage, the actual, concrete friendship (to Plato only the "most important step, the arduous leap, to be taken in the ascent to heaven), that has most interest for us. This "wandering about seeking beauty in which to create," this "finding a fair and noble and well-nurtured soul," this "fair speech about virtue and the nature and pursuits of a good man," with the "far nearer tie than binds husband and wife, a common offspring fairer and more immortal than mortal children"—all this has been preserved for us more effectually than in Plato's art in the actual deeds of men.

"Pelopidas," says Plutarch, "was of an illustrious family in Thebes, as was also Epaminondas. Brought up in affluence, and coming in his youth to a great estate, he applied himself to relieving such necessitous persons as deserved his bounty. The Thebans with grateful hearts enjoyed the liberality and munificence of Pelopidas. Epaminondas alone could not be induced to share in it. Pelopidas, however, partook in the poverty of his friend, glorying in a plainness of dress and slenderness of diet, indefatigable in labour, and plain and open in his conduct in the highest posts. Epaminondas and he were both equally inclined to every virtue, but Pelopidas delighted more in exercises of the body, and Epaminondas in the improvement of the mind. Among the many things that reflected glory upon both, there was nothing which men of sense so much admired as that strict and inviolable friendship which subsisted between them from first to last, in all the high posts which they held, both military and civil."

Partly a spirit of imitation and partly a likeness of circumstance made the men of the Renaissance in many respects the counterpart of the men of the prime of Hellas. And one of the connecting links between the Renaissance and the Hellenic spirit was its attitude to friendship. The passion for personal beauty, the enthusiasm in the presence of a noble life, and the idealisation of friendship, and the use of it to give joy and meaning to the human riddle, and knit up the loose ends of man's existence in a worthy aim, are emotions present no less in the heart of the Renaissance than in the generous imagination of Plato, though never perhaps fused so successfully into an organic whole as in Plato's dream. We find at least these feelings, isolated but supreme, one in the sonnets of Shakespeare, so puzzling and unsatisfactory in many ways, but, however that may be, the most complete expression of the passion for beauty apart from the passion of sex; another in the love which Sir Philip Sidney inspired in so many of his fellows, making Lord Brooke have graved on his own tomb, years after the death of the object of his affection, "Friend of Sir Philip Sidney," and Matthew

Rowdon cry, in his "Lament for Astrophel," with an inspiration born not of the writer, but of the theme, "continual comfort in a face," and

"Ye gods, it is no sin nor shame
To love a man of virtuous name."

There is the beautiful after-glow in Sir Thomas Browne's "Miracle of true friendship! One soul in two bodies!" Most interesting of all, the close attraction of Montaigne and La Boétie from intellectual sympathy developed a warmth of emotion that, by common reckoning, is entirely antagonistic to all which the intellect comprehends. Montaigne and his friend were both of mature age when they met, and La Boétie was the elder of the two. An essay of his called *The Voluntary Servitude*, "in honour of liberty against tyrants," fell into the hands of Montaigne and made him curious to see the author. They met by accident at a great city entertainment, and "found themselves so mutually taken with one another, so acquainted and so endeared between themselves, that from thenceforward nothing was so near to them as one another." Montaigne says that they felt that some inexplicable and fatal power had brought on the union. When they met their friendship sprang into being on the instant. They knew that it had begun so late, and, by some secret presentiment, that it was to have so short a continuance, that there was no time to lose in forms. There was such an affinity between their natures that the soul of each stood naked and self-revealed before the other. While most men have at least a few secrets which nothing would induce them to disclose to their very nearest, and almost all find it impossible, much as they may desire it, to make their inner selves articulate even to the dearest sympathy, this pair of friends had no reluctance and no disability. They had "mixed and worked themselves into one piece, with so universal a mixture, that there was no more sign of the seam by which they were conjoined." If any man importuned Montaigne to give a reason why he loved his friend, he found it could be no otherwise expressed than by making answer: "Because it was he, because it was I."

"This friendship," he says, "has no other idea than that of itself; this is no one particular consideration, nor two, nor three, nor four, nor a thousand. 'Tis I know not what quintessence of all this mixture, which, seizing my whole will, carried it to plunge and lose itself in his, and that, having seized his whole will, brought it back with equal concurrence and appetite, to plunge and lose itself in mine. I may truly say, lose, reserving nothing to ourselves, that was either his or mine. . . . Common friendships will admit of division; one may love the beauty of this, the good humour of that person, the liberty of a third, the paternal affection of the fourth,

the fraternal love of a fifth, and so of the rest. But this friendship that possesses the whole soul, and there rules and sways with an absolute sovereignty, can possibly admit of no rival. A singular and particular friendship disunites and dissolves all other obligations whatever."

Such a type of friendship was little likely to flourish in the eighteenth century. The young giant of the Renaissance was drunk with the enthusiasm of new life and the freshness of a new world. The eighteenth century, weary of riot and sated with indulgence, was sober as the most careful avoidance of enthusiasm and novelty could keep it. The men of the Renaissance dwelt in a mountainous world, with vast prospects and distant heights lost in the extremity among rolling mists. The eighteenth century was a plain, illuminated by a level sunshine, and its inhabitants were well pleased to be spared variety of landscape and mutability of sky. But they cultivated their garden with assiduity, and in that garden grew the homely flower of friendship.

If one has recourse to the most likely sources for a notion of their life, friendship in those days seems to have been a very homely thing indeed. "Isaac Bickerstaff" and "Mr. Spec." give us many pictures of the comfortable intimacy of old age, grown out of long-standing acquaintance. Quiet, cheerful conversation in the chimney-corner, recalling half-forgotten men and things, is the ground-work and essence of them all. And, if we go to representations of a later date, in Fielding's and Smollett's novels friendship has scarcely any place. To Roderick Random Strap plays the part of a debased Sancho Panza, as Partridge does to Jones. Peregrine Pickle does not spare his friend, Godfrey Gauntlet, the most cruel insult, and Colonel James attempts, at the prompting of a sensual caprice, the last injury to Captain Booth. Here are no Damon and Pythias, no Orestes and Pylades. It is only in such a case as that of the superannuated Matthew Bramble that importance is given to ties of this kind, when the business and joys of life are past, and nothing remains but to soothe the weariness and irritability of age with what cheerfulness of occupation is possible. In youth the passions and interests are hopelessly strong against a placid sentiment.

The obligations of the family were pressed home by hundreds of eager preachers; friendship was left in the position of a comfort and ornament of the dregs of life. It was to be cultivated only as the thrifty man lays by a sufficiency against the decay of his working strength.

But a different complexion was put upon this solace of conversation by a number of men of genius bound together by common interests. It had a meaning for them which it could not have for the mass of mankind, and which they could not give to it for others. Receiving the sentiment at a very low pitch of intensity, they trans-

formed it into something in the highest degree respectable, which, however, could not win its way into popular regard, and change the temperature of popular feeling. In the letters of Swift and Pope and Bolingbroke, and others of their friends, there is left on record a close association for the same objects and in the same interests between men differing much, originally, in temperament and even character, but bound together by the possession, in every case, of talents of the first order, and the desire to make the best of them. With the exception of Addison and Steele, who were outside the association by reason of something more than politics, all the "Queen Anne's" men of the first order—besides Swift, Pope, and Bolingbroke, there are Gay, Congreve, Arbuthnot, Berkeley, and Garth—were associated in terms of affectionate intimacy. Many of them without family ties, less subject, through their preoccupation, to the general distractions of passion and interest, in the fullest exercise of their powers, naturally, somewhat late in life, they had for each other an unvarying attraction, not impulsive or subject to any access of exaltation, but such as continually to stimulate each one through it to make the best of himself.

They had not a very lofty ideal of truth, and very little appreciation of beauty. It was no personal magnetism that brought them together, it was no ambition of ultimately philosophic heights that led them on through all those years. Almost despairing at times of truth, always sceptical of their possession of it, they had a natural detestation of sophistry, error, and stupidity. So much of truth as they could see they worshipped and served, not with rapture, but with a steady zeal. What they loved above everything else, for itself and not for any great results which they expected from it, was the free play of intellect. That consoled them for what at best they considered to be the pitiful business of life. That they loved, and that they loved each other for promoting. Theirs was perhaps the most purely intellectual friendship that the world has seen. Wanting the poetry of Platonic friendship, of attachments like those of Montaigne and Sir Thomas Browne, it has a grave and melancholy charm peculiar to itself.

Here is part of a letter from Lord Bolingbroke, after his return from exile, to Swift, in his retirement in Ireland :—

"I know not whether the love of fame increases as we advance in age ; sure I am that the force of friendship does. I loved you almost twenty years ago, I thought of you as well as I do now, better was beyond the power of conception, or, to avoid an equivocal, beyond that extent of my ideas. Whether you are more obliged to me for loving you as well when I knew you less, or for loving as well after so many years, I cannot determine. What I would say is this : whilst my mind grows daily more independent of the world, and feels less need of leaning on external objects, the ideas of friendship return oftener, they busy me, they warm me more. Is it that we grow more tender as the moment of our great separation approaches ? or is it that they who are to live together in

another state (for *vera amicitia non nisi inter bonos*) begin to feel more strongly that divine sympathy which is to be the great bond of their future society? There is no one thought which soothes my mind like this; I encourage my imagination to pursue it, and am heartily afflicted when another faculty of the intellect comes boisterously in, and wakes me from so pleasing a dream, if it be a dream."

This is from Pope to Swift, who was hurt at the fancied neglect of Bolingbroke :—

"Can you possibly think he can neglect you, or disregard you? If you catch yourself at thinking such nonsense your parts are decayed. For, believe me, great geniuses must and do esteem one another, and I question if any others can esteem or comprehend uncommon merit." Others only guess at that merit, or see glimmerings of their minds. A genius has the intuitive faculty. Therefore, imagine what you will, you cannot be so sure of any man's esteem as of his. . . . I will not quarrel with the present Age; it has done enough for me, in making and keeping you two my friends. Do not you be too angry at it. It has done and can do neither of you any manner of harm as long as it has not, and cannot, burn your works. While those subsist, you'll both appear the greatest men of the time, in spite of Princes and Ministers, and the wisest, in spite of all the little errors you may choose to commit."

It is, of course, a mistake to suppose that a virtue is never practised unless it has been glorified in an ideal. There were good husbands before love had been re-modelled by the ideals of chivalry; there were moral lives before the Hebrew genius had conceived a moral ideal, and tender mothers thousands of years before the Christian religion set a sanctity about motherhood. But when virtue is comprehended in an ideal which generally modifies, to some degree, the character of the period, wavering adherence is confirmed, and loyal adherence is exalted. And when the ideal is absent, or is peculiar to a few minds, the practice of that virtue which wants the confirmation of an ideal is for the most part slurred, and, when carried out, falls short of delicacy and grandeur.

The causes which make friendship of little account generally to-day are partly causes deterrent from its practice, and partly a changed outlook on the world. The strife, perhaps not for existence, but for satisfactory conditions of existence, leaves little inclination to form any ties that are not literally riveted on by necessity. And the strife begins so early; it has fastened on its victims long before they enter on the regular business of life. Games and studies were once the instruments of forming connections which all the violence of succeeding contests could not entirely sunder. But now these very studies and games serve as initiation into the ambitions of manhood. He knows very little of boyhood who dreams that it is free from the feverish agitation of later days, and more open to generous impulses of admiration. There is often a more frantic jealousy aroused by the making up of an eleven than by all the appointments to a Cabinet.

Men are irritated by the assertion of a sentiment which is generally incompatible with their pursuits. Such assertion jars upon them as not being in good taste, since they feel that it is an attempt to fasten upon them an invidious comparison, and, knowing their own capacity and situation, they suspect, too, a latent hypocrisy. The more successful they are in maintaining, among large groups of themselves, a loyal spirit, the more enraged they become at any closer drawing together of a few individuals within it. Particular friendships are a fraud perpetrated on the general body. Worse still, they are a conspiracy for its disintegration.

The random utterance of a single man-of-letters may be set aside, but it cannot be disguised that when Tennyson published the *In Memoriam* such tribute to the idea of a lost friend was bitterly resented. And the same thing might happen to-day. Deep grief that was justified by no formal tie was regarded as morbid. To mourn a friend after the lapse of years was a deplorable weakness, if not a sin against society. The poet was false to his mission, which was to glorify the aims of his fellows.

Apart from the practical obstacles to the prevalence of friendship, the dominant sentiment of philanthropy has set in strongly against it. Various circumstances, among which the foremost place should perhaps be given to the eloquence of the first preachers of the religion of humanity, have impressed the general mind with the paramount duty of improving the common lot of mankind, while self-improvement is a duty which has been less urgently proclaimed. Friendship is more closely allied to self-improvement than to the tendance of mankind at large, and is therefore looked upon in the light rather of a piece of indulgence.

The world nowadays, that is, the intelligent, articulate world, has always a foreboding consciousness that it is surrounded by an inarticulate, unintelligent world, lowering and threatening to burst into frenzied rebellion. That at least forbids men to treat the religion of humanity with disrespect, and the most scornful walk softly when they think of the fierce, dark masses on whose mercies a luckless chance may throw them. An aristocratic sentiment like friendship has fallen on evil days. Yet some of the greatest democrats among authors, especially, for instance, Walt Whitman and Thoreau of Walden, have tried to make it the corner-stone of a new structure of society. But they lived in solitude, or hovering on the borders of a young civilisation, not harassed by forebodings nor jaded in its sensations. And friendship is most fitting for a young world.

J. A. NICKLIN.

THE HISTORY OF THE FORMS AND MIGRATIONS OF THE SIGNS OF THE CROSS AND THE SU-ASTIKA.

PART IV.—THE PRE-ZODIACAL ERA OF THE TWO-SEASONS YEAR OF THE PLEIADES.

IN order to understand clearly the origin and developments of the time symbols of the Cross and the Su-astika, we must study not only the ages when the principal factor in the conception of the year were the four seasons of St. George's Cross, with which we have hitherto been principally concerned, but we must also learn clearly the history of the previous computation of time. In doing this we see that the first stage was the discrimination of Night and Day. These were the dwarf gods, the Phœnician Pataikoi, who, as they increased, became the time-gods of the measured year. This in the conceptions of Hindu chronology grew into the year of destiny, including within its limits ages of human progress. It was as one of the attempts made to record the history of a country under the guise of the events of a year that the great national historical epic poem, called the *Mahābhārata*, or the History of the Great Bhārata, sons of the Bur fig-tree (*Ficus Indica*), was written. It is told in eighteen books, each of which represents a month of the eighteen-months year of the sun-horse, which is sacrificed at the close of its annual career in the "Ashvamedha Parva," the fourteenth of these books, and the poem finally ends in the contest of the eighteen Akshauhinis, or axle-(aksha) turning divisions of time, who mystically slay one another. This dying year about to be replaced by the new epoch arising out of its ashes is the contest of the eighteen tribes of Yādavus, the sons of the barley-god Ya-va and of Krishna the black antelope, originally the dwarf god of time. The year thus used as a dramatic symbol is the year of the eighteen sacrificial stakes (or months) to which the victims offered at the Ashvamedha sacrifice were bound. Each month contained four weeks of four days each, the whole forming a complete sun-circle of 360 days. It was the year of the sun-physician, for six of the sacrificial stakes were of bel-wood (*Egle marmelos*), whose fruit is a most valuable aid in digestive medicine and in the cure of dysentery. Of the remaining twelve stakes, six were cut from the Khadira, and six from the Palāsha-tree, of which I have already spoken. It was this year which

was followed by that in which the annual feasts were no longer those on living totem victims, but on the sacramental fruits of the earth mixed with milk in various forms, and running water. It was from this change of custom that the national sacraments, of which I have spoken at the beginning of this essay, originated, and also the later sacramental meal of the sons of the date-palm-tree, made of dates, butter, whey, curds, and honey. This is now partaken of by some Arab tribes, and especially by the Bami Hanifa, meaning "those who do what is right," who still call themselves sons of the date-palm-tree.¹ This was the tribe to which Abraham belonged, according to the *Kūrān*, II. 60, and it was he who, according to the *Kūrān*, VI. 75, worshipped, as the sign of the one God, like the Sabœans of Mesopotamia, the Pole-star, which does not set. It is from the study of this Pole-star worship, the predecessor of sun-worship, that we shall be able to understand the evolution of the solar symbols, whose history we are now studying.

The change in ritual which marked the final acceptance of the solar year ruled by the sun, who traced his annual path through the heavens by the zodiacal constellations, was one which was, to a great extent through the influence of the Southern tribes, now thoroughly incorporated into the Northern totemistic confederation. This amalgamation of races, whose ancestors entered India from all points of the compass, was that called in the *Song of Lingū* the confederacy of the eight tribes of Gonds, the ruling races of the Indian eight-rayed star. These are divided into four superior and four inferior tribes. The first four tribes were (1) the Mana-wajas, or those who made images of the gods, the Trident-worshipping artisans or Takkas sons of Vāhlika; (2) the Dahak-wajas, or drum-beaters, the workers in leather used for their drums; (3) the Koila-butal, or dancers, who danced the seasonal dances in honour of the creating gods; (4) the Koi-kopal, or cow-keepers, the Hindu Gautuma, ancestors of the Brahmins, and sons of the moon-bull (gūt) god. They were the ruling race of kings and priests, the Hindu Shantanu and Devāpi. The inferior tribes were (5) the Korkus, the Kolarian sons of the mountain (koh), also called Mundas and Mallis, with the same meaning; (6) the Kolamis, or those who marry by simulated capture, and celebrate their marriage by mixing the blood of the bride and bridegroom, a custom still preserved among the agricultural Khewuts, Kurmis, and Rantias, and among the two castes of Kshatryas or warriors, and Kayasths or writers, who are classed as higher in the social scale; (7) the Bhillas, or sons of the bow (billa), the aborigines of the West who use the bow, the weapon of the Northern hunting races; (8) the Koto-tyal, the primæval root-stock of the forest tribes, called sons of the log of wood (kotot), and Marya or tree (marom) Gonds.

¹ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. ii, preface p. xxi., note i., essay ix. p. 338.

These are in the Gond cosmogony said to be the dwellers in the Gond land of Central India, whence they radiated, according to tradition, over the whole country. They represent the traditional dwellers in the land where the solar worship and solar measurements of time of the dominant Northern races first began to supersede the primeval rule of the Pole-star worshippers. This was the age of the creator of the district priests, still called Ojhas, or men of knowledge (odj), the nucleus of the Brahmin community. Their duty is to regulate the incantations and spells of the magicians, and to encourage the use of white magic, the magic lore of healing and of averting the catastrophes of pestilence, storms, and droughts, in preference to the black magic, which made its chief object the destruction of enemies and of those who incurred the hatred of the magician or his paymasters. Their rulers were the trading artisans and cattle-herdsmen, the men of ten (agur), the ten months of the gestation of the cow. This ancient name for ten (agur) still survives in the primitive secret tribal language of the Kasbhara, or workers in metals, including the Sonars, or goldsmiths, and perhaps also in the name of the Agurwalas, one of the wealthiest guilds or castes of the trading classes, who trace their descent to the Nāga races, and many of whom are Jains. They call their tribal ancestor the Raja Agur Nath, or lord (nath) of ten, the ancient name of the first year of months, the ten months of gestation. This became in the later Aryan dialect of the non-Turanian rulers Dasa-ratha, the ten (dasa) chariots (ratha), the name of the father of Ram, the ploughing sun-god son of Kush-aloya. The Agurwalas still preserve in their tribal history the memory of the time when the old rule of the early sacrificers of living victims, the totem gods of the tribe, was abrogated by the reformers, who substituted for these bloody feasts the tribal meals on grain, milk, and running water. They tell how the reform was made by their father-god Raja Agur Nath, at the close of the slaughter of the eighteen victims offered at the opening of the year, begun by the Ashva-medha horse-sacrifice, the year of eighteen months or stakes. The reform begun by the Gond Ojhas was continued during the succeeding ages of national progress, stimulated by fresh swarms of Northern immigrants, and it finally culminated in the later rule of the Ikshvāku Jain kings, who not only forbade the destruction of life, but added to the original Jain rules the Buddhist precept forbidding the use of the intoxicating drink still consumed as a source of inspiration by the priests of the aboriginal magic rites. It was this prohibition which made all the Hindus of the upper or twice-born classes total abstainers, as they still continue to be. It was one made by the authors of the revised Soma sacrifice, who obliged all who joined in the tribal sacramental annual feast to fast during its continuance, drinking nothing but milk, and to acquire a new birth by washing away their sins in the river bath of baptism. It was those conquering sun-

worshippers who called the old votaries of the Pole-star gods Nis-hadhas, the name by which they were known in the *Mahābhārata*. It means those who "are not sons" of the sun-fish-god ruling the month of June-July, called Āshādha, the month now called Āsār, which began the year with the summer solstice. This is the same name as that of the supreme Semite-Babylonian god Assār, the fish-sun-god of Nineveh, the fish town. He was the Jewish god Ashur, the eighth son of Jacob, born before Issachar and Zebulun, the last of the sons of Leah, and Joseph and Benjamin, the sons of Rachel the sun-ewe. The whole history of this process of national reform seems to imply the infusion on the introduction of sun-worship of a large Semite element; and this tradition of Jewish influence has been perpetuated among the Hindus in the Sanskrit name of Vid-arba, or the double (vid) four (arba), by which the country is called in the *Mahābhārata*. It is the land of the Vedic Nāga snake-god Arbuda. This is the god of the mother mountain Arbuda of the Jain sons of Rishabha, the sun-bull born of the mountain goddess Maru, the mountain sacred to the four gods ruling space. This name is now corrupted into that of Mount Abu in Saurashtra (Guzerat), the kingdom of the Saus or Shus, sons of the bird. This is the mother mountain of the great unitarian race who are now the heads of the Indian trading community and who trace their descent from Hittite stocks. It is to Arbuda and Jaratkara, the Pole-star, whom I have shown to be the parents god of Astika, the god of the eight, that hymns are chanted in the ritual of the Vedic Soma sacrifice. The ruling year gods of the liturgy in which they are invoked are the rain-god and the Pole-star god, for the first season cup is drunk to Shukra, the rain or wetting god (sak), the god Shesh-Nāg; and the last, called the Ukthya or cup of praise (uktha), to Dhruva, the god of the Pole.¹ This god of the Semite four (arba), the god of the Hittite Khati who came from Syria, is apparently an importation of the god of the mother city of the sons of Judah in Palestine, the city Hebron, called Kiriath-Arba, the city of the four. It was the city of Caleb the dog (kalb), the fire-dog born from the mother of fire called Mātārishvan, the mother of the dog. He is in the genealogy of I. Chron. ii. 10-18, the brother of Ram the sun-god and the descendant of Perez, the breach or cleft, the son of Judah and Tamar the palm-tree, and he was certainly the fighting warrior of the tribe of Judah and the chief coadjutor of Hosh-ia the sun-god, the Jehovah of the Hus, or sons of the bird (khu), and the sons of the Pole-star god David. He was apparently the Dog-star Sirius, who became, as I shall show presently, in Akkadian astronomy the ruling god of the year of four seasons called the year of the black antelope, beginning with the summer season consecrated to the Dog-star

¹ Eggeling's *Sat. Brūh.* iv. 3. 3. 1, 2. *S. B. E.* vol. xxiv. pp. 331, 332; 292, 293.

Sirius. Caleb, the fire-god the conqueror of Kiriath-Arba, was the fourth god in addition to the former gods of the year of three seasons, called in Joshua xv. 17, Shesh-ai, Ahi-man, and Tolmai. These names are admitted by all scholars to be totally inexplicable as Hebrew words, and I have shown in *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, Vol. I. Essay III. p. 189, note 2, that they were almost certainly the gods of the Turanian Takka artisans who came to India from Asia Minor. They were headed by Shesh-Nāg, the Shesh-ai of the Bible, who, as I have shown, ruled the Takka year as god of the spring, while Ahi-man is the Sanskrit god Ahi the snake, who was in Greece the Echis, father of the Achaioi, while in Egypt the Indian name Ahi was given to Osiris in his character of the child snake.¹ He is one of the three-headed snake-gods of the year of three seasons killed by Indra in the *Rigveda* as Ahi-shruva, the swelling snake, the dwarf child god who was to become the ruling sun-god of the year. Tolmai seems to contain the name of Tal-tal or De-dal, meaning "the very wise," one of the Akkadian names of I-a, who is shown by his name to have been originally a mother goddess, a son of Shar, who was the winter mother of the coming year, the year of the victory of the conquering sun-god Ahi of the summer season born of the union between the mother cloud and the ocean father god the wet snake.

This apparently was the year founded by the Takka artisans before they started on their journey into India from Balkh, and was a year of the early cult of the fire worshippers. This creed originated in the land of Atāro Pātakān, the modern Adarbijan, the home of fire (atar), the petroleum land of Baku on the south-west shores of the Caspian Sea. This was watered by the mother river of the Indian Kaurs, the Kur or Araxes descending from Mount Ararat. It is called in the *Zendavesta* the Daityā, or second mother river² in the Airyana Vaego, the parent land of the Zend fire worshippers sons of the bull Iru and the cow Idā or Irā, whose first mother river was the Euphrates born of Hu-kairya, the mother mountain Ararat. The Kur is the river of the parent fire-serpent Azi-Dahāka, the Zend form of Ahi, who had three heads representing the three seasons of the year, and was slain by Thraētaona, the Vedic Trita, the fire piercer (tri) of the clan Athwya, the eight. He was killed in the four-cornered Varena,³ the Vara or garden of god, the mother home of the fire-worshipping races watered by the Kur and Euphrates. The victorious fire-god married the two wives of Azi, the daughters of Yima the twin, whose names Savanghavach and Erinavach meant the speakers of the speech (vach) of the East (savangha) and of the west land of Era, the sheep mother who became the cow

¹ H. Brugsch, *Religion und Mythologie der Alten Ägypter*, pp. 288-213.

² Darmesteter's *Zendavesta*, *Fargard*, i. 3. *S. B. E.* vol. iv. p. 5, notes 2, 3.

³ Darmesteter's *Zendavesta*, *Abān Yasht*, xi. 33, 34. *S. B. E.* vol. xxiii. p. 61.

mother Iā. He went on his way to Balkh from Atāro Pātakān through the land of Rai or Ragh, the later Media, where Zarathustra, the reputed founder of the Zend faith, was said to have been born. He was, according to the *Bundahish*,¹ the son of Karshipta, the hawk, that is, of the sun-hawk. It was he who substituted Bhang or Hashish as the source of the inspiration of his missionary priests for the intoxicating drinks of the sorcerers and witch doctors of the Turanians whom his disciples converted. He was one of a triad of divine teachers named Frashaostra, the teaching priest,² the Hindu Prashastri, Jamaspa—the twin horse (Jama) the sun horse (aspa), the stars Gemini and Vistāspa its rider. He was the great sun-king of the sun-worshipping Aryans of the family of the Nao-taras or New Stars, that is, of the planets which had been looked upon in the days of fixed star and Pole-god worship as wandering rebels, but which were, when the path of the moon and sun through the stars began to be observed, looked on as attendants and chief ministers of the sun-god. This king is called in the *Zendavesta* Hushrava, the glory (shrava) of the Hus, the conqueror of the Turanian Frangrasyan, the king of the irrigating race of Kurs who had covered the land round lake Kashava, the home of the Indian branch of the Kur or Kushika race, with water channels of a similar type to those his Akkadian counterpart Akki the irrigator had led through the lands of Mesopotamia. The coadjutor of Frangrasyan and the ruler of Kang-dez—the modern Kangra in the Punjab—was Keresavazda, he of the horned club, the Takka trident. This king—also called in the *Bundahish* Kai-khusrov—is said to be the king who, with the special help of the Bāhrām fire of the mother mountain goddess Bahu and the sun father god Ram, destroyed the idol temples on the Chaachasta Lake, the modern Urumiah in Adarbaijan. He is the conquering god of the *Rigveda* called Su-shravas, the glory of the Sus, the sons of the Akkadian Finn bird-mother Khu, who conquered (1) the Purus under Kutsa, the clan of Zarathustra whose father is called Purush-aspa, the horse of the Purus; (2) Atithigwa, a name of Divodāsa, the god of the Hittite ten lunar months of gestation; and (3) Ayu, the god of the fire-drill, the son of Pururavas.³ These three divine essences, united in the triad of the teaching priests, the sun-horse, and the sun-king its rider, are said in the *Bundahish* to have given birth to the Bāhrām firē, the perpetual holy fire of the Parsi temples. This is the fire of the mother goddess Bahu, the mountain mother goddess of the Phœnicians and Assyrians, represented by the Hittite sign of a triangle enclosing another, and of the sun-god Ram, the Rāma Hvasstra or wind-god of the *Zendavesta*, Ram-anu the Assyrian god (anu) of storms, the god Ram or Rama of the Hindus, Ram or Rimmon of

¹ West, *Bundahish*, xxiv. 11. *S. B. E.* vol. v. p. 89.

² Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. ii. essay ix. pp. 300 ff.

³ *Ibid.*, vol. i. essay iii. pp. 273, 274; vol. ii. essay ix. pp. 394, 395.

Syria, and Ab-ram the father (ab) Ram of the Jews, who married Sara the mother of corn, the mountain cloud-bird. It was through the teaching of Zarathustra that the cult of the ephod arose. This was originally the skin of the totem animal worn by all members of the tribe on their initiation into manhood and womanhood, and became the sacred shirt of the Parsis, now made of muslin or the cotton cloth of the land of Kur. It is round it that the sacred girdle of seventy-two threads is wound, and the threads represent the seventy-two five-day weeks of the sun year of 360 days and eighteen months of twenty days each, the year of the eighteen stakes. This was the sacred robe of the inspired priests and the baptismal garment of all Parsis. It was consecrated in the Hebrew ritual by Gideon, the destroyer of the sacred groves and the Ashūra or rain gnomon-poles, and also of the triangular tower Penuel the face (pen) of God, the temple of the goddess Bahu.¹ This is the ephod said in the Bible to have been consulted by David the Jewish sun-god, the Moabite and Phœnician god Dod or Dodo, the beloved one. The land of Ragh where this religious reformation was born was the land consecrated to the Lithuanian sun-god Rai or Ragh. The Finn Akkadians—who changed the name Bhar of the original fire-god of Asia Minor, the father of the Indian Brighu, the fire-priests, into Bil or Bel—called this god Lakh, and, as his ideogram meaning lord of the abyss proves, they worshipped him as the god ruling the vault of heaven. Ife, called Lakh-mu, with his consort Lakh-amu were the creating gods born from the mother the cloud-goddess called here Mummu Tiāmut, the Akkadian name for the constellation Krater the cup.²

It was these Northern fire and sun worshippers sons of the mountain and the mother cloud-bird Shara or Khar and the sun-god Ragh or Ram, who came to India first as the Turanian Gonds ruled by the ploughing sons of the cow, the Nāga races, and secondly as the irrigating Kaurs, the growers of cotton, dyes, and fruit-trees. These when joined by the sons of the sun-horse became the ruling race called the Bhāratas, or sons of the Bur, the banyan fig-tree, the allied Kauravyas and Pāndavas, who as sons of the eight-rayed star of the barley-growing sun-god were joined together as a wedded brotherhood by the Soma sacrifice. This was the common meal on milk curds, barley, and running water, which was in Italy reproduced in the Confarreatio, the most binding form of Roman marriage ratified by the wedding meal on barley (far) cakes, eaten together by the bride and bridegroom as a sign of brotherhood. This custom was one derived from the still earlier customs of the ancestors of the

¹ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. i. preface xlii-xvi.

² Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures for 1887*. Lect. vi. pp. 384, 385. Sayce, *Assyrian Grammar Syllabary*, No. 228. A. Brown, jun., F.S.A., *Eridanus, River and Constellation*, chap. xxiv. § iv. *Puphratean Constellations and Mythic Personages*, p. 72. Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, essay iv. pp. 333 ff.

corn worshippers. These acknowledged their national union by eating together the totem animal, which was first merely the clan totem; but this became among the fire-worshipping sons of the god Rā the pig eaten in the North at the winter solstice, and still sacrificed to Rā-hu by his Behar fire-priests the Dosadhs. The custom is one belonging to the age of the institution of matrimony, when the married couples, besides eating together, exchanged their blood.

But for the real origin of all these customs culminating in the idea of uniting the sons of the eight-rayed star in the common bond of union, we must go back to the still more primitive times when the first villages were founded. As I have shown in the *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, village life first began in India in the Palæolithic age, before agriculture was practicable in Europe owing to the cold of the Glacial epoch. It was the Indian tribes living in the south of India and the islands of the Malay Archipelago who first carved their villages out of the forests where they dwelt. Agriculture was then, as it is at present among the wandering forest tribes of India, chiefly the work of the women. It was they who first conceived the idea of adding crops grown from the seed they sowed to the tribal food-stocks of forest fruits, roots, and game brought in by the male hunters. These early villages, like those now founded by the Oraons of Chutia Nagpore, were all built under the shelter of a grove formed of the forest trees left standing in the centre of the land selected for the village site, and this grove is looked on as the home of the gods of life, the protectors of the village. Round this ran the circuit of cultivated land, the sacred snake which still in the belief of the Turanian Gonds guards the village boundaries, and the boundary line is called the holy snake. This was the Ahi of the *Rigveda*, meaning the holding or encircling snakes. This was also the Egyptian Ahi, the Greek Echis, the guardian of the boundaries of all villages in South-western Asia, Greece, and Egypt, where the sacred grove or Temenos, the consecrated place containing the temples of the gods, always occupied the centre of the village. It was there also that the fire-worshippers placed the shrine of Hestia or Vesta, the goddess of the village hearth.

These Indian forest races were the first growers of cereals, the rice, which was originally a wild grass still found throughout the southern rice-growing districts of India. It is the first sprouts of this wild rice, the parent of the field rice, which are still hung up in their houses in August by the peasants to ensure a good crop. They could not grow this rice crop, nor the dry millet crop Mundla (*Eleusine corocana*), the "Raggi" of Madras, which is also the product of a wild grass, without having an accurate knowledge of the signs denoting the seasons of sowing and reaping, and of the beginning and end of the rainy seasons; and they therefore tried in

their earliest efforts in systematic agriculture to find some means of measuring the year. Like all Southern people, they dreaded the sun, which burnt up their crops, unless these were protected by seasonable and, in the case of lowland rice, by almost daily rains; and they also looked on the cool hours of the night as the pleasantest part of the day. It was then that they observed the stars, and noted their rising and setting and return to the same positions every twenty-four hours. In these observations they found that only one star, the Pole-star, never sets, and they thence deduced the inference that the other stars went round the Pole just as the branches of a tree would go round if the trunk was made to revolve. In their search for a star measure of time their object was to find one that marked the beginning of November, the Southern spring, and this they found in the Pleiades, which set immediately after the sun on the first of November. This continued till the beginning of April, when the Pleiades disappeared from the night sky to return again in May, and to set before the sun from that time till the end of October. They therefore measured their year by the movements of the Pleiades, and began their year and their day at sunset; and as they were people living near the equator, both of these began, like the year and day of the Jews, at six o'clock in the evening.

In order to explain these movements of the Pleiades and the regular rising and setting of the stars and the sun, they said—according to the story still preserved by the Australian aborigines—that the black crow-star, the great star Canopus in Argo, who was first a grub in a tree, ran away with the Queen of the Pleiades, who had plucked him from his hiding-place. In the South Indian popular story Canopus is the great ape, the guardian of the village, who brings the winds and the rains; and the tree in which, according to the Australian story, he was a tree-grub is the central tree of the world's village grove, and it was on the top of this he was supposed to sit and turn the stars round as the god ruling the winds which certainly moved the clouds, and also, as they further proceeded to infer, the heavens beyond them. The never-ceasing movements of the revolving heavens, impelled on their course by his mighty hand, were marked in this year by the weeks of five days, representing his fingers. This week was, as I have shown, that used by all the earliest worshippers of the Pole-star god before the six and seven days week was introduced.¹ This star-god is called in the *Mahābhārata* Agastya, and he is said to have become, by his wife Lopāmudra, the moon-fox (lopūsha), who also appears with him in the *Rigveda*, the father of the three Dravidian tribes, the Cholas, the Hindu Kols, sons of the mountain (koh); the Chiroos, or sons of the bird; and the Pandyas, the fair (pandu) race, sons of the sun-antelope. Agastya is also said, in the *Rigveda* VII. 33, 10, 11, to

¹ Hewitt, *History of the Week*, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, July 1897, pp. 8 ff.

have brought forth from the lightning, that is from the womb of the cloud-goddess Shar, Vashishtha, the superlative of Vasu, the most creating god, the perpetual fire burning on the national altar, the Hindy equivalent of the Zend Bāhrām fire, born from the mountain (bahu) and the sun (ram), as Vashishtha is born from the cloud. This creating lightning produced by the star-god Canopus proves that he was a god who turned the fire-drill of heaven, and thus produced the perpetual fire of heaven engendered from the lightning, the burning and creating sun, which measures time by its annual circuits round the Pole marked by the equinoxes and solstices. In the *Ramāyana* Canopus appears in his primæval form as the ape Sugriva, the neck (griva) of Su, the Chiroo mother-bird (Khu), who is wedded to Tarā, the Pole-star. This myth, as I have proved elsewhere, points to a time when the ape-god ruled the year, divided when the Rāma legend was framed into 360 days, as the leader of the 360,000 apes who helped Rama to rescue Sitā, the moon, from Rāvana, the storm-god dwelling in Lanka (Ceylon), the island of the South Pole. As the Pole-star ruled time before the age of the rule of the independent sun steering its own course through the stars, the ape who was wedded to the Pole-star must have been a star-god, and must have been in conjunction with it. In other words, the Pole-star must have been in the constellation of the Ape. This constellation of the Indian Ape Kapi—the Egyptian Hapi, the early name of the god who became Set, the vanquished (st) god, the Greek Kepos, the Latin Cebus—is the constellation Cepheus, and the stars α and γ Cepheus were the Pole-stars from 21,000 to 19,000 B.C. That the tradition uniting the constellation of the Ape-god with the Pole-star was taken to Egypt is proved by the name of the Thigh of Set given to the Great Bear. It was the Thigh of the Ape-god wedded originally to the Pole-star in the constellation where its head was placed, and lying outstretched beneath the Pole-star, to which it points.

These primæval founders of villages who worshipped the guardian snake and the ape wind-god Maroti, the modern Hanuman, who turned the stars from the tree (marom), always began their year with a feast of first fruits and a three days' festival to the dead; a custom still surviving in the Southern Hemisphere. It is the Indian festival of the Dibāli, or feast of lamps, held on the new moon of Khartik (October-November), the month of Krittakas or Pleiades. This they brought to Europe together with the worship of the village grove and tree, the sacred snake, their custom of common meals, and their communal tenure of village land. This feast to the dead still survives in the holy days of Hallow Eve, all Saints' and All Souls' Day, observed all over Europe. Also the year beginning in November was that of the Druid, or tree (dru) worshippers of the god Hu, the Zend god Hu-kairya. It still survives in England in the custom common in several counties of hiring

farm servants for the year on November 1, while the second season is universally observed in the May-day dances round the maypole. It is the beginning of this year in November which was celebrated in Greece in the women's festival of the Thesmophoria. It was a festival of the mother mountain goddess, held in a cave to which no men were admitted. It was thought to commemorate the mourning of Dēmētēr for the loss of her daughter Persephone, the summer sun-goddess, but this was a Northern perversion of its original Southern meaning, which made it the beginning of the new year. The goddess Dēmētēr to whom this feast was dedicated was not the sun-mother of the barley-growers, but an earlier goddess of Arcadia called also Despoina, the mistress, to whom all fruits of cultivated trees except the pomegranate could be offered.¹ The pomegranate was a fruit consecrated to the barley sun-god, and it was when Rā the sun-god of showers, the rain-god Ram of India and Assyria, became in Damascus the sun-god ruling the year in place of the star-god, that his name was changed from Ram, the Ramas of Hesychius, to Hadad Rimmon, the swift god of the pomegranate. Pomegranates were not allowed to be eaten at the Thesmophoria. That the feast came from the South is proved by the story of Herodotus that it was brought by the sons of Danaus from Egypt,² when the star ruling the northern parts of the Nile was Karbanit (Canopus), that is, by the worshippers of the Southern Pole-star god Danu. It was held on the 11th of Puanepsion (October–November), the Bœotian month Damatrios, and was the new year's festival of the corn and crop growing races.³ This was also the date of the festivals of the Chalkeia in honour of Hephaistos the fire-god and Athene, which was held on the 9th of Puanepsion, and was immediately preceded by the Apaturia, or annual council of the Phratræ or village brotherhoods, when the names of new members and of all children born during the preceding year were registered. It was at the close of the feast that the tribal fathers lighted at the state hearth the torches with which their own year's fires were to be kindled.⁴ Hence these Grecian village festivals furnish complete proof that they were those derived from the early founders of villages who began their year in November. This proof of the migration of the November year from Egypt, where it was celebrated as the launching of the year-boat of Osiris the barley-god in Chœiak (October–November), to Greece shows that it was a year of maritime races; and as it originated in the south of India and the Southern Hemisphere, it must have been brought westward by the only maritime races on the shores of the Indian Ocean—the Indian peoples of Malabar, who alone possessed coasts furnished with ship-building timber.

¹ *Pausanias*, viii. 37, 7; 42, 1; 10, 10. Bérard, *Origine des Cultes Arcadiens*, pp. 126, 196, 197.

² *Herod.* ii. p. 171.

³ Bérard, *Origine des Cultes Arcadiens*, pp. 126, 184, 196, 342.

⁴ Rhys; *Hibbert Lectures* for 1886. Lect. v. p. 517.

It was these people, the founders of the first villages, who made coasting voyages in their primitive boats in search of fresh sites for cultivated villages. They thus reached the Persian Gulf and the Euphratean land of Mesopotamia, where they found that the soil and climate were not suited to the rice they had grown in India. Hence they, as they had originally done in India, looked for wild grasses to supply grain crops. These they found in the wild forms of wheat and barley, which all botanists are agreed in classing as Mesopotamian products. These they took to Asia Minor, and from thence they emigrated to Europe as the Basque cultivators of the Neolithic age, whose cereals, fruits, and domestic animals all came from Asia Minor and Mesopotamia. They also took with them their national customs regulating the government of villages, the formation and government of provinces, the unions of the sexes, and the birth and education of children. These villages were ruled as in India by the head man elected by the tribal brotherhoods, and ten or twelve united villages formed a Parha or province. Every man in the province had a right to become the father of a child of any woman within its limits, provided she was not a woman of his own village, all of whom were to him as sisters. In order to provide for the birth of the children necessary to maintain and increase the population of each village, its women used, by a custom still surviving among some Indian forest tribes, to invite the men of another near their own to the dances held in the village Akra, or dancing ground below the shade of the village grove, at the beginning of each season of the year. Thus all the children born in each village became the children of the village parent-tree, who never knew their fathers. They were brought up by the village matrons and elders, who separated them from their mothers as soon as they were old enough to dispense with her care. They, like the children now born in the villages of the Marya or tree Gonds, the Oraons and Nāga tribes, were brought up in houses assigned to the children of each sex, and the education of the boys was superintended by a village elder, and that of the girls by a matron. It was under this system of education that the custom of teaching by stories or folk-lore tales began. These political and matrimonial customs were taken by the Indian farmers, with their other institutions, to Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, and Greece, and they survived in the dances held in these countries in honour of the mother goddesses Istar, Mylitta, Cybele, and Aphrodite, and in the traditions of the rule of the Amazon women who were said to have ruled in all the early cities of the coast of Syria and Asia Minor. In all the Phœnician ports the mother goddess, who was first the tree and Pole-star goddess, the goddess dwelling on the mount of heaven, was worshipped in preference to the later male gods. It was as the mother tree-goddess that she became mother of the Ram-sun, who was, as we have seen, born from the

cypress-tree. But, though the original mother goddess of the first founders of villages was a star and tree goddess, yet the sun did not remain without worshippers even in the primæval times of Indian history. For the first creating nation who changed the scattered villages of the first cultivators into organised communities of allied settlements forming a compact Parha or province were the Mundas or mountaineers who came into India from the north-east rainy lands of Burmah and Southern China, where their congeners still dwell. They brought with them the worship of the sun-god Sri-Bonga, who dried and warmed the rain-sodden forests of their mountain land, and it is to him that they sacrifice cocks, the bird whose original home is on the forest-clad coasts on the east of the Bay of Bengal. This was the bird sacrificed in Greece to the sun-physician Asclepius, thus proving the Indian origin of this phase of the sun myth, which was, as I have shown, the foundation of the worship of the sun as the eight-rayed star.

These Mundas were succeeded by the Māles or mountain Finns who immigrated both into Mesopotamia and India from the North-east, and became in Mesopotamia the Akkadians or highlanders, whose language still survives in their writings preserved by their successors the Semite Assyrians and in their inscriptions at Girsu. This proves them to be an Ugro-Finn race who traced their descent from the mother mountain, the Akkadian goddess Is-tar, daughter (tar) of the mountain. This was the heavens mountain, the home of the flying cloud, the bird-mother Uk-ko, who dwelt in the Pole-star, called in the *Kalerala* Taivahan napanen, the navel of heaven, and who became the goddess Shar. They were also votaries of the household fire in the centre of the family houses beneath the centre pole supporting the roof of their circular huts, and they based their national organisation, not on the aggregated village, but on the family living in each hut and ruled by the house-mother, the priestess of the fire, while the husband provided by hunting and fishing for the food and maintenance of its inmates. It is to the house pole, the sign of the father god of the house called Gumi, that the Dravidian Māles of the Santal Pergunnahs sacrifice goats, letting the blood flow into the mother earth in which it is fixed. They also, besides the worship of the Pole-star, venerated the sun-god as the god of day, and it is in his honour that they always place in front of their houses a pole as the supporting pole of the heavens house, and as a gnomon to mark its daily changes. It is among these people that the belief in the fertilisation of the mother earth by the blood of the tribal totems originated, and this belief culminated in the age of the Twin gods in the systematic offering of human sacrifices. In the age when time was reckoned by the months of gestation, desire of offspring became the ruling passion in each family, for it was only the parents of many children and grand-

children who could succeed in making themselves more powerful than those who had fewer descendants. It was in the belief that the sacrifice of the eldest son, whose blood fertilised the ground round the tribal village altar, would be rewarded by the birth of many more children to the sacrificer that this sacrifice became a distinguishing feature of the Semite religions. We can trace its origin in the Hindu story of King Jantu in the *Mahābhārata*, whose sacrifice of the son born from the first of his hundred wives was repaid by the rebirth of the dead son from his own mother and the birth of a son to each of the remaining ninety-nine. The custom began among the warrior and hunting races of the North, who ate their enemies in the hope of thereby acquiring their valour and prowess, and it was these sacrifices which were offered to the goddess Artemis of the Tauric Chersonesus by the race who worshipped her as the goddess of the constellation of the Great Bear, which was first that of the seven deer—the seven does sacred to Artemis. The doe was offered to her in place of Iphigenia, when the virgin sacrifice was exchanged for the consecration of the dedicated virgin as the priestess of Artemis. These sacrifices were originally those offered to the god of the household fire, the god called Moloch by the Phœnicians, meaning the master (malik), and he was the Hindu god Agni. It was as a consequence of the substitution of totem animals for the human victims that the custom of self-mutilation among the males and the dedication of their virginity by women became an integral part of fire worship in South-western Asia. These consecrated men and women were victims sacrificed to the god. The actual custom of the sacrifice of infants continued till a late period among the corn-growing races who called themselves the sons of the rivers, and it still prevailed in India till the close of the last century. In Greece it apparently died out with the custom of offering the hair of all young children to their river parent gods as a substitute introduced by the sons of the grass and corn for the earlier sacrifices. It was in accordance with this custom, which was one common to all the races of South-western Asia, who had, according to Jeremiah v. 20–26, their hair polled, that Achilles, as recorded in Hom. II. xxiii. 141–146, offered his hair to the river Spercheios. In Italy these human sacrifices were introduced by the Turanian seafarers of the East, and they survived in a mock form in the twenty-four men of rushes annually thrown into the Tiber on the Ides or 15th of May from the Sublician bridge, built in prehistoric fashion without the use of iron. These rush men, called Argei, were doubtless the survival of an ancient human sacrifice offered to the river-god in May, the mid-month of the Pleiades year. In the passage of Varro recording the sacrifice only xxiii. Argei are said to have been thrown, but this number must have been originally xxiiij., for the following reason. These sacrifices to the river-god


were, as I have shown, originally sacrifices to the fire-god of the household fire, that is, to the Hindu god Agni, who was originally the Lithuanian god Agon. The custom of offering eleven victims, one for each month of the gestation of the sun-horse, which were, tied to the sacrificial post, the descendant of the house and gnomon pole, proves that the number of these victims offered to the year god at the beginning of his year, when the household fires were lighted, were regulated according to the national method of computing time. We find in the ritual of the *Brāhmanas* the reckoning of a year consecrated to Agni the fire-god, which seems to have been derived directly from the year of the sun-horse of eleven months, and to have become the official sacrificial year before that of eighteen months of twenty days each divided into seventy-two weeks of five days, which I have already spoken of as the year of the sun-physician. That this year was one inaugurated by the kindling of the national fires is proved by the Brahmanic ritual, for its course is represented in the kindling stanzas chanted by the priests. These are fifteen in number, and each stanza is divided into three lines of eight syllables in each, or twenty-four syllables. These fifteen stanzas or fifteen months of twenty-four syllables or days made up, as the *Brāhmanas* tell us, the year of 360 days. Also the direct descent of this year from the year of eleven months is equally clear, for the number of stanzas in the kindling hymn sung is only eleven, the number in all, except two, of the hymns in the *Rigveda* called the Apri hymns sung at the offering of animal victims; but to make up the fifteen stanzas the first and last stanzas are ordered to be each repeated three times over.¹ As the number of the victims of the year of eleven months was proportioned to the number of the months, so in the present sacrifice the number was made proportionate to the number of days in each monthly stanza consecrated to the fire-god, to whom eight, the number of the eight-rayed star, was sacred. Also as we are told in the *Brāhmanas* that the first sacrifice was man, and that the substitute for this original human sacrifice was the mock drowning in the baptismal bath of the sacrificing victim whose hair had been offered to the river-god,² there can be scarcely any doubt that originally at this sacrifice twenty-four human victims, the number of the Roman Argei, were slain. The great sanctity attached to this number twenty-four is shown in this being the number of the Jain Tirthākaras, beginning with Rishabka the bull, and also of the Buddhas, who, according to the story of Sumedha, which begins the *Nidāna-kathā*, or History of the Buddhas' origin with Dīpankara, the first Buddha who consecrated Sumedha, the sacrifice of the Su, and Su is the root of

¹ Eggeling's *Sat. Brāh.* i. 3; 5, 6-9. Hewitt, *History of the Week*, WESTMINSTER REVIEW, September 1897, pp. 244-246.

² Eggeling's *Sat. Brāh.* i. 2, 3, 6; iii. 1, 2, 1 ff. *S. B. E.* vol. xii. p. 50 : vol. xxvi. pp. 5 ff.

Soma. Sumedha began his career as a teacher of the doctrine of the Ten Perfections: (1) Alms-giving, (2) Moral Practice, (3) Self-abnegation, (4) Wisdom, (5) Exertion, (6) Patience, (7) Truth, (8) Resolution, (9) Good-will, (10) Equanimity. His career, therefore, evidently began under the rule of the series of sacred numbers which began with the ten lunar months of gestation of the cow, and ended with the rule of the sun-fish-god, who tracked his course through the sky by the ten zodiacal stars called the Ten Kings of Babylon, whose united reigns lasted for 132,000 years, the number of seconds in the circle of 360 degrees, and the number of years in the Hindu 'Kali Yuga, or the modern epoch. Dipankara, whose name means the "nascent light," dwelt in the city of Rām-mā, the mother of Rām, that is, of the Kushite mother Kushaloya, and he there founded a monastery called Su-dassuna, the manifestation (dassuna for darshan) of the Su, and it was he who raised up Sumedha, who came down from the Himalayas as the flying year-bird Su, and who grovelled in the mud at his feet. Thus this "nascent light," who raised up to heaven the flying year-bird and tracked his course through the stars, is clearly the star Hamal the Ram, the star in Aries which was the first of the Ten Kings of Babylon. The year thus indicated is, therefore, one beginning, as I have shown, when the sun was in Aries about the 20th of February, the year of the Bull Phalgun. But the calculators of this new year, like all other makers of Hindu sacred years, did not lose sight of the previous solar year not reckoned by the zodiacal path of the sun, or by the equinoxes and solstice, but by accommodating the solar year to the original year of the Pleiades with its mid-month of May. May was the first month of the year of the twenty-four Buddhas from Dipankara to Kassapa inclusive, the year of fifteen months of twenty-four days each, which was followed by the sun-year of the Buddha fish-sun, beginning like the Pleiades year in November, under the guardianship of the moon-goddess. That this deduction is correct is proved by the coincidence between the beginning of the Roman year of twenty-four victims and the year of the Turanian Gonds. This began with the Akkadi or Plough sacrifice held on the 18th of Baisakh (April-May), or about the 9th or 10th of May, almost exactly the same date as that on which the Roman victims were thrown into the Tiber. This festival is one evidently of Northern origin, for it is held at a time of year when ploughing is utterly impossible in North India, when the soil is baked by the heat; yet at it the plough sacred to the Plough constellation of the Great Bear must be run over the ground, the making of agricultural implements be begun, and every one, as was the custom at the beginning of the Roman year, must do some work at his special craft.¹ It was these ploughing races originally coming from

¹ Hewitt, *Ruling Races of Prehistoric Times*, vol. iii. pp. 230, 231.

the North who spread the worship of the eight-rayed star, the fire-sun-god Agni, over the world. It was they who were worshippers of the Indian god Sakko, the Buddhist name of Sukra, or of the god Sek Nūg, who instituted the worship of the eight-god Āstika, the Phœnician Eshmun—a worship recorded in the traditions of the Phœnician Sanchoniathon, a name meaning “what Sakko has given”—and who invented the symbol of the Su-astika, or bird of the eight, a symbol representing the course of the sun, and corresponding in its name with the Buddhist name of Su-medha, the sacrifice of Su, and of Su-dassana, the manifestation of Su, the first teacher and monastery. This sign of the annual revolutions of the sun-bird of the eight-rayed star was the left-hand or female Sū-astika, whose genealogy dates back, as I shall show presently, to the worship of the bird mother of the woodland village races, the woodpecker—the Latin parent god Picus of the Iat or gnomon-pole. This was the Sū-astika of the Buddhas, ending with Kassapa or Kashyapa, the father of the ploughing race. The right-hand Su-astika, the sign of the ruling sun-god, who shapes his own course through the heavens, and is not dragged or driven round the pole like the dependant stars, is that engraved on the feet of the last of the Buddhas, the great physician, the rider on the sun-horse. It was the votaries of the female or left-hand Sū-astika who gave to Carthage, a city where human sacrifices were constantly offered, the name of Kakkabi, the Star; and that the star was the eight-rayed star of its founder the Phœnician goddess Dido, a female form of Dod or Dodo, the Jewish David, and daughter of Belus, the fire-god, the Akkadian Bil-gi, is proved by the Carthaginian coins. On one of these the goddess mother with ears of corn, the star Min or Virgo, is depicted on one side, and on the reverse the sun-horse and the eight-rayed star; and this triad of the virgin mother, the sun-horse, and the eight-rayed star, is repeated on a coin of Empiricæ, a Carthaginian colony in North-west Spain in the Gulf of Lyons.¹ In the computation of the year measured by the daily revolutions of the stars dragged round the Pole as Canopus dragged the Pleiades, the stars were looked on as turning contrary to the course of the sun from east to west, the course marked by the rising, culmination, and setting of the stars to an observer looking northwards. It was these people who formed these ideas of the motions of the heavenly bodies who represented the course of the rising and setting sun born of the mother-tree as that shown in the left-hand or female Sū-astika,  As the mother of all the village-born farming races, and as the seat of the ape-god who turns the stars round the Pole, the tree was from the first dawn of civilisation persistently connected with the computation of time. They took this image of the tree with them from India, and this became the sacred Northern

¹ Bérard, *Origine des Cultes Arcadiens*, pp. 138, 139, 140, note 1.

Pole which marked as the Gnomon the course of the sun. This token transferred from wood to stone became the Scandinavian and Celtic Hir-men-sul, or great (hir) stone (men) of the sun (sol). It was originally the trunk of the world's tree, the Ashēra of the Jews, and this was perpetuated in Northern countries in the wooden pillars set up by the Saxons and Frisians, and these became, as Count Goblet d'Alviella has shown, the Perrons or stone pillars, the symbols of communal liberty and authority, in most of the cities of Eastern Belgium.¹ These are the survivals of the stone menhirs of the Neolithic age, which are found in every country in Europe and Asia from the far North to the Indian Dekkan. They mark the migration southward made in the Neolithic and Bronze ages by the races formed in the North by the union of the indigenous hunters with the agricultural immigrants of the South. They appear in the obelisks of Phœnicia and Egypt, and in the phallic pillars on which the mother-bird sits in the Phœnician monuments in Matabeleland. It was this wood and stone pillar which became the shaft of the Latin or Celtic cross, when the god bound to the Northern constellation Draco was made the turner of the Pole instead of the Southern ape-god.

J. F. HEWITT.

¹ D'Alviella, *Migration of Symbols*, pp. 102 ff.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE.

PHILOSOPHY AND THEOLOGY.

IN the WESTMINSTER REVIEW for December 1897 there appeared an article, by R. Didden, on Dr. Otto Gaupp's "Herbert Spencer," in *Frommanns' Klassiker der Philosophie*. We have now the pleasure of calling our readers' attention to another volume in the same admirable series—*The Life and Teachings of Immanuel Kant*, by Friedrich Paulsen.¹ It is probable that the knowledge most English readers have of Kant is confined to Professor Max Müller's translation of the *Kritik der reinen Vernunft*, and Noiré's introduction to that translation; but if Noiré was right in saying that "Kant is the greatest philosophical genius that has ever dwelt upon earth, and the *Critique of Pure Reason* the highest achievement of human wisdom," we cannot know too much about the life and teaching of this remarkable man. We, therefore, feel supremely grateful to F. Paulsen and his publishers for the volume before us. In rather less than four hundred pages the author condenses a most interesting sketch of the life of the philosopher of Königsberg, who was born in 1724, and died at a good old age in 1804. His life was uneventful, and is summed up in one pithy sentence by Herr Paulsen: "Er war ein deutscher Professor alten Stils, arbeiten, lehren, Bücher schreiben, ist der Inhalt seines Lebens." It is none the less interesting to follow our author in his sketch of Kant's intellectual development and his estimate of his character, as well as to be made acquainted with some incidents of a more personal nature. The last words that any one heard fall from his lips was the grateful expression "Es ist gut," and over his grave is inscribed part of the well-known sentence from the *Critique of Practical Reason*, "The starry heavens over me and the moral law within me." Herr Paulsen, in an introduction, discusses Kant's place in the history of the world, and his relation to his own times, which is followed by the account of his life and philosophical evolution. The remaining 300 pages of the volume are devoted to an analysis of his chief works and an exposition of his system as a whole, for which we can have nothing but

¹ *Immanuel Kant, sein Leben und seine Lehre*. Von Friedrich Paulsen. Mit Bildnis und Einem Briefe Kants Aus dem Jahre 1792. Stuttgart: Fr. Frommanns Verlag (E. Hauff). 1898.

praise. A striking frontispiece from a photograph by Messrs. Niemeyer (of Steglitz) of the Kant-Lessing group by Rauch. In this reproduction the contrast between the philosopher and the poet is impressively brought out. The volume also contains a facsimile of a letter written by Kant to his brother in 1792.

It is more than eight years since the first edition of Édouard Schuré's successful book, *Les Grands Initiés*, was the subject of a review in these pages ;¹ he has now produced what may be regarded as a sequel to that work in *Sanctuaires d'Orient*,² and we can give it as hearty a welcome as we did his former book ; it is marked by the same charm of style, the same exquisite feeling, and the same ingenious blending of history, religion, and romance. Nine years ago, M. Schuré says, he rendered a first testimony to the immemorial or holy esoteric truth, of which he is the humblest representative. His present work adds a second stone to the building of the temple. His theory is that all the great religions are based upon the same great truth—the secret recognition by the initiated of the Eternal Spirit, the soul of the world—the creative Word. M. Schuré has now paid a visit to the sanctuaries of the East—Memphis, Thebes, Athens, Eleusis, and Jerusalem—and what he saw, thought, and felt he has recorded in the interest of esoteric religion. This is much more than a book of travels ; with the eye of an artist and poet he looked upon the ruins of ancient temples and the aspects of nature in the lands he visited, as a searcher after truth he saw everything in its relation to man's conception of God. It is impossible to give any *résumé* of these pages which would convey to our readers a fair impression of the author's remarkable gifts, but we may refer to the striking account of his visit to the Holy Sepulchre, where Jew, Mussulman, and Christian meet face to face as avowed enemies, forgetful of the fact that their religions have a common origin. But Jerusalem only represents one element in M. Schuré's synthesis—Egypt and Greece supply the other two elements of the universal religion. “ La trinité de Thèbes, d'Éleusis et de Jérusalem n'est-elle pas la trinité éternelle de la Science, de l'Art et de la Religion, fondus et transfigurés dans la Vie intégrale ? ”

A volume of twelve “Tracts for the Times”—*The Triumph of Faith*³—contains some interesting reading, notably a reprint of the Rev. Stopford A. Brooke's “Reasons for Secession from the Church of England.” Other papers are by the Revs. R. A. Armstrong, John Page Hopps, Walter Lloyd, C. J. Street, and several American Free Church ministers. Mr. Stopford Brooke also contributes the paper, or sermon, which gives its title to the volume.

¹ WESTMINSTER REVIEW, December 1889.

² *Sanctuaires d'Orient* : Égypte, Grèce, Palestine. Édouard Schuré. Paris : Perrin et Cie. 1898.

³ *The Triumph of Faith*. Tracts for the Times. Fourth Series. London : Philip Green. 1895.

The Rev. M. F. Sadler's *Church Commentary on the Books of the New Testament*¹ has attained to the position of a standard work amongst the class of readers for which it is designed, so that a new and uniform edition is sure to be appreciated, and this Messrs. Bell and Sons are now producing. The edition is in a handy form, and the paper, type, and printing are excellent. In the introduction, on the origin and sources of the four Gospels, Mr. Sadler gives his reasons for rejecting the theory that there was some original common document, or documents, from which each of the Evangelists drew the material for his Gospel; and we think he makes out his case, and that at least the first three were compiled from oral tradition, though this admission is not altogether in favour of the authentic character of the Gospels; neither is the recognition of the fact that in the Acts of the Apostles—"an account covering at least thirty years"—we have no reference to any written account of the life of Jesus.

The sixth and seventh volumes of the Eversley Series edition of the *Holy Bible* (Macmillan & Co.) are upon our table. Volume vi. contains the Old Testament books Ezekiel to Malachi, and volume vii., the New Testament, Matthew to John.

The Rise and Progress of Presbyterianism, by the Rev. George Broadley Howard, B.A., with appendices on Toleration and Unity, is a polemical essay on behalf of episcopacy, and gives an unfavourable impression of its rival—not altogether without justice, we may admit, for the Presbyterian Churches have not been remarkable for their tolerance and liberality. (London: John Hodges. 1898.)

SOCIOLOGY, POLITICS, AND JURISPRUDENCE.

The Inner Life of the House of Commons,² by Mr. William White, has quickly and deservedly reached its second edition. Mr. White was originally a bookseller in Bedford, and was appointed assistant-doorkeeper to the House of Commons by Lord Charles Russell in 1854, and soon afterwards became doorkeeper. In 1855 he commenced those admirable descriptions in *The Illustrated Times* which are here reproduced under the editorship of Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P. With Mr. McCarthy's editorship we have only one fault to find. The same description of the same scenes occurs too frequently. In periodical literature this was quite correct and natural—indeed,

¹ *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*. By the Rev. M. F. Sadler. With Notes, Critical and Practical. London: George Bell & Sons. 1898.

² *The Inner Life of the House of Commons*. By William White. Edited, with a Preface, by Justin McCarthy, M.P., and with an Introduction by the Author's Son. Two Vols. London: T. Fisher Unwin. 1898.

inevitable, but here, after having once described a full house on some great night, it seems unnecessary to set out all the detail over again. One full house is much like another. Apart from this small blemish, we have nothing but admiration for the work as it stands. The book is one of the most valuable contributions to the political history of our times that it is possible to have. Written by an eye witness such as Mr. White, a man of rare observation, wide sympathies, critical judgment, and sound common sense, a man, too, fully capable of using these great powers to the fullest advantage, and of expressing his opinions and sentiments in terse admirable language, we have a book steeped in the spirit of the times and redolent of the peculiar atmosphere of our great popular assemblage.

Mr. White's forecasts, too, were singularly accurate. In sporting language, he almost invariably spotted the winner, and his readings of character also have been proved by subsequent events to be remarkably correct. Speaking of Lord Salisbury, then Lord Robert Cecil, in 1863, he wrote: "moreover, he is too Conservative for modern times. He is a High Churchman. In politics he is a Tory. His motto and religion is 'No surrender.' The nation may have outgrown its vestures, but he would not enlarge or alter them for the world. He is not a man to stretch the old formula to meet the new facts. He would rather, by all the force he could command, compress the facts into the old formula. In short, he is a man of a past age, has no sympathy with the life and stir and growth of the present, and no belief of the future." How little has our great cynic altered since these words were written!

Mr. White's studies of Cobden, Bright, Bismarck, Bulwer Lytton, and Gladstone, together with a host of other leading politicians, could scarcely be bettered. On page 120 we notice one curious mistake. Surely Lord Strafford de Redcliffe could never have been known as "the venerable Lord Chancellor"!

The appearance of *The Monroe Doctrine*,¹ by Mr. W. F. Reddaway, is singularly opportune at the present moment. This little treatise is the result of some competition, and chapter ii., we are told, has been condensed from the more elaborate form of the original, and to our mind has for the general reader been condensed too much. The international relations in 1823 were extremely complicated, and there can be very few persons acquainted with all the diplomatic complications which gave rise to the Monroe doctrine. Notwithstanding this defect, however, if defect it be, Mr. Reddaway gives a very clear account of the origin, growth, and development of this principle. He points out that its origin was due to George Canning, and its application in its original shape to John Quincy Adams. That its suggestion was due to Canning we do not remem-

¹ *The Monroe Doctrine.* By W. F. Reddaway, B.A., Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1898.

ber to have seen elsewhere, and bearing this in mind Lord Salisbury's flouts and sneers in 1895 are the more unwarrantable. The recent suggestion by Sir Frederick Pollock for a joint declaration by the United States and Great Britain of the Monroe doctrine is exactly the suggestion advocated by Canning. It would be curious to know whether this is a coincidence or a plagiarism.

Of the numerous text-books devoted to the elucidation of the law of torts, Mr. Ringwood's *Outlines of the Law of Torts*,¹ in its third edition, is now the latest in the field by some years. The most important features of the present edition are the consideration of the effect of the recent decision contained in the judgment of the House of Lords in *Allen v. Flood*, and the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897. The effect of this Act is clearly set forth and the Act itself is incorporated in the text, with some explanatory foot-notes. Special attention has also been given to some of the valuable judgments delivered in the Irish Courts. These are too frequently disregarded by practitioners in the English Courts, where, although not binding, they are treated with respect by the judges. In cases where authority was lacking we have ourselves derived much assistance from some of these Irish decisions.

In our opinion this is a thoroughly reliable text-book for students.

Messrs. Williams and Norgate send us a pamphlet by Dr. Karl Walcker of Leipzig, with the comprehensive title, *Die Kompetenz der Religion, der Ethik, des Patriotismus, der Verfassung, Gesetzgebung, Justiz, Presse, der Vereine und der Öffentlichen nationalen und internationalen Meinung mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Frage, der Beleidigungen und der Pressfreiheit*. We cannot add much to this, more than to say that these seventy-six pages are crammed full of information bearing upon the subject, gathered from the history and literature of most of the European nations. We notice two little slips on page 8. Professor Walcker refers to Defoe as the author of "Robinson" and quotes from his "Trueborn English."

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

THE history of the French Huguenots is absorbingly interesting. In H. C. MacDowall's volume, entitled *Henry of Guise and other Portraits*,² an admirable account is given of some of the persons who figured prominently in French history at the period of the

¹ *Outlines of the Law of Torts*. By Richard Ringwood, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Third Edition. London: Stevens & Haynes. 1898.

² *Henry of Guise and other Portraits*. By H. C. MacDowall. London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd.

Massacre of St. Bartholomew. The study of Catherine of Navarre is in its way a perfect piece of work.

Messrs. Mason and Woodhouse's *History of Rome* (390-202 B.C.) is a good specimen of a well told historical narrative of events known to all educated persons. The questions on Roman history at the end of the book will be found very useful.

It is time that the life of Vincent Priessnitz² should be written. He was the founder of the modern hydropathic system, and as such he rendered great service to humanity. He was a native of the town of Freiwaldau in Austrian Silicia. He entered the medical profession, and devoted his attention at a very early period to what is commonly known as the water-cure. He soon astonished the world with his views. His treatment of patients was certainly very successful.

BELLES LETTRES.

GUSTAVE FLAUBERT is perhaps the greatest master of style amongst French novelists. His works have been until recently all but unknown to English readers. The series of translations published by the enterprising firm of H. S. Nichols, Limited, should therefore be regarded as most acceptable, having regard to Flaubert's exceptional merits as a writer of fiction. The latest work of the great French novelist which the firm has brought out is a translation of *L'Education Sentimentale*.³ The translator, Mr. D. F. Hannigan, in his introduction, says: "*L'Education Sentimentale* differs from all Flaubert's other works. It is entirely free from sensationalism. It depends for its interest on its fidelity to life. To those who seek in fiction for the fantastic and the unreal it will, no doubt, appear dull. To those who expect to find in a novel a truthful and vivid delineation of human nature, it will recommend itself as a monumental work—a book which covers as large a field of observation as *Vanity Fair* or *Midlemarch*, and which is free from the conventional limitations of these celebrated English works of fiction." This is high praise; but those who dispassionately read the novel will be inclined to agree with it. The character of Frédéric Moreau, the young man who, starting in life with bright prospects, does nothing except to love

¹ *History of Rome* (390-202 B.C.). London: W. B. Clive.

² *Vincent Priessnitz, Founder of Hydropathy*. By Richard Metcalfe. London: Metcalfe's London Hydro, Ltd.

³ *Sentimental Education*. A Young Man's History. Authorised Edition. Translated from the French, with an Introduction, by D. F. Hannigan, LL.B., Barrister-at-Law. Illustrated with seventeen Original Designs after S. Gorski. Two Vols. London: H. S. Nichols, Ltd.

another man's wife, "not wisely but too well," is unique in modern fiction. The story has a certain nobleness and dignity comparatively rare in French fiction, owing to the unconquerable virtue of Madame Arnoux, the object of Frédéric's love. This is one of the most beautiful portraits of a woman given by any novelist. The work covers a large field of incident, and the variety of characters introduced is very striking. We have Arnoux, the sensual picture dealer; M. Dambreuse, the speculator and politician; his wife, who hates him because he has an illegitimate child whom she has for the sake of society to call her niece; Deslauriers, the shabby, mean-souled advocate, who sponges on Frédéric; Cisy, the fatuous aristocrat; Pellerin, the painter, with his sham artistic enthusiasm; Regimbert, the man who does nothing but criticise Cabinet Ministers, and who lives on the earnings of his wife; Madame Moreau, the proud but poor lady, who lives in the hope that her son will one day be a great man—a hope doomed to be disappointed; Rosanette, the courtesan, who changes her lovers with facility, and ends by marrying that rich, lecherous old man, M. Oudry—all these are persons who are not merely drawn from life, but who really live, if that is possible, in the pages of this great novel.

The translation catches the spirit of the original. This does not mean that an English version of *L'Education Sentimentale* can equal Flaubert's French. This is really impossible, but Mr. Hannigan should get the credit of having done everything in his power to reproduce the language of Flaubert, in so far as English can be at all an adequate equivalent for French, and especially the French of so individual and fastidious a writer. We will not, though tempted to do so, give any extracts. It is better to recommend readers who desire to make acquaintance in an unexpurgated English version of one of the greatest masterpieces in French fiction to read Mr. Hannigan's translation of the book for themselves. When they have perused it, they will, as the translator suggests at the close of his introduction, say: "This, indeed, is life—the sober, terrible, grotesque reality." The illustrations, though not perfect, are excellent in many respects. The book ought to be welcome at a time when so much interest is taken in Flaubert's personality owing to the publication of his correspondence with Tourgenyev, whom in many characteristics he resembled, though in style as well as in knowledge of the more subtle phases of character he surpassed the great Russian novelist.

Those who have read *En Route* will be rather disappointed with M. J. K. Huysmans' later book, *La Cathédrale*.¹ There is a lack of human interest in the work. The "mental and spiritual develop-

¹ *The Cathedral*. By J. K. Huysmans. Translated from the French by Clara Bell, and edited, with a Prefatory Note, by C. Kegan Paul. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co.

ment" of Durtal does not absorb our attention sufficiently to make us enjoy this recrudescence of mediæval mysticism. The style is admirable, though we fear the translator has not always succeeded in conveying a good idea of M. Huysmans' strongest characteristics as a writer. In some cases we find an oddity in the English which we are not likely to encounter in the original French. For instance, in the very first chapter we read: "Closing the procession came a few belated priests with one hand gathering up the gown that *ballooned* behind them." While we do not agree with Mr. C. Kegan Paul as to the value of this production, either from a religious or a moral point of view, we would like to have justice done to an author so unique as M. Huysmans. The allusions to Durtal's temptations of "the flesh" are very gross, but can it be possible that the author thought it an advantage for his hero to have "emasculated" himself? Here, again, we doubt whether the author and the translator are at one. Taken altogether, however, the version is readable and intelligent, and will give a tolerably good general idea of a book which, with all its merits from the standpoint of literary form, has a tendency towards "spiritual" drivel, and shows a reactionary tendency towards the most objectionable form of monastic sentimentality.

The late Mr. S. H. Reynolds was a man of great culture, and had a mind well stored with knowledge of all sorts of subjects. His widow has found the collection of the essays in the present volume "a labour of love." In his short but interesting preface, Professor Saintsbury points out that most of these papers had been written more than thirty years since, so that many things to be found in them would now be regarded as commonplaces. When written, however, the opinions which now appear so general had not passed into "the limbo of the obvious." The papers on "The Fathers of Greek Philosophy" and on "The Critical Character" appear to us to be the most valuable in the book. The author has a sober and finished style, and he conveys his meaning with admirable lucidity.

*Trewyant of Guy's*¹ is a strikingly original work of fiction. The picture of medical life contained in it is exceedingly vivid, and its realism is of the kind which cannot be blamed for sinning against art. We congratulate Mrs. Coulson Kernahan on having written a novel of a high order, which will greatly add to her reputation.

Those who desire to know something about such great classical writers as Æschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Thucydides, Herodotus, Xenophon, Plato, Lucretius, Virgil, Sallust, Cicero, Horace, and Ovid, so as to be able to approach the deeper study of

¹ *Studies on Many Subjects*. By Samuel Harvey Reynolds, M.A., late Vicar of East Ham. With a Preface by George Saintsbury. London: Edward Arnold.

² *Trewyant of Guy's*. A novel. By Mrs. Coulson Kernahan. London: John Long.

them with a good general knowledge of the subject, should read *The Classics for the Million*,¹ by Mr. Henry Grey. The volume is an excellent and thoroughly scholarly epitome.

*The Story of Lois*² is one of Katharine S. Macquoid's best novels. It is a curious study of a woman's complex nature. The story is free from mere conventionality, and shows that freedom and that breadth of treatment which are best described by the word "modernity."

A Point of View,³ is another distinctively modern book. It shows how friendships of a complex character may exist between a married man and a woman who is not his wife. The study of Simon, of his wife Dorothea, and of Philippa, whom he loves while Dorothea is living, cannot fail to interest the reader.

Hugh Wynne Free Quaker,⁴ by Dr. S. Weir Mitchell, is a good specimen of historical realism. It purports to be the autobiography of one of Washington's officers. There is an old-world air about the narrative which has an inexpressible charm. We cannot pronounce the book to be a great work of art, but it is highly interesting.

*Fighting for Favour*⁵ might have been written by Mr. Crockett. It is a Scottish romance of the same sort as *The Grey Man*. We do not admire Mr. Crockett, and have little respect for his imitators. We would be sorry to find romance degenerating into a series of productions of this kind.

In the University Tutorial series Milton's *Paradise Regained*⁶ has been brought out with a learned introduction and useful notes by Mr. A. J. Wyatt. The notes are not merely explanatory of the text. They possess a distinct literary value. Take, for instance, the admirable contrast drawn between the hypocritical Satan of *Paradise Regained* and the heroic figure in *Paradise Lost*. We heartily recommend this book to all students.

*The Romance of a Nautch Girl*⁷ is not an every-day sort of book. The writer of this strange novel knows India well, and in some passages she uses Hindoo words of the most unusual description. The characters of Dr. Manning, Beryl, and Minachee are firmly limned, and the narrative flows along in a limpid and dramatic style, which holds the reader spellbound.

*All They Went Through*⁸ is the title of a very readable volume

¹ *The Classics for the Million*. By Henry Grey, F.R.B.S. London: John Long.

² *The Story of Lois*. By Katharine S. Macquoid. London: John Long.

³ *A Point of View*. By Caroline Fothergill. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith.

⁴ *Hugh Wynne Free Quaker: Sometime Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel on the Staff of His Excellency General Washington*. By S. Weir Mitchell, M.D. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

⁵ *Fighting for Favour*. A Romance. By W. G. Tarbet. Bristol: Arrowsmith.

⁶ *Paradise Regained*. Edited by A. J. Wyatt, M.A. Lond. and Camb. London: W. B. Clive.

⁷ *The Romance of a Nautch Girl*. By Mrs. Frank Penny. London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co., Ltd.

⁸ *All They Went Through*. By F. W. Robinson. London: John Long.

of short stories by that clever writer of fiction, F. W. Robinson. Two of these stories, "Taggett's Two Wives" and "The First Mrs. Wareham," are highly dramatic, and might each have been easily elaborated into interesting novels of the ordinary length.

• Mr. J. E. Muddock is a writer who has gained a respectable reputation in fiction. Though he has faults, he has unquestionable merits. He possesses genuine narrative power—and this is an indispensable part of a novelist's stock-in-trade. *The Lost Laird*¹ is by no means the least interesting of Mr. Muddock's stories. The scene is laid in Scotland soon after the battle of Culloden, and there are some exciting situations in the book.

Mr. Percy Fitzgerald's Critical Examination of Dr. E. Birkbeck Hill's edition of Boswell's *Life of Johnson*² is an example of the slashing order of criticism. Mr. Fitzgerald shows that there are grave mistakes in Dr. Birkbeck Hill's work; but he is scarcely fair in his general estimate of the value of the edition. Moreover, much of the criticism is hypercritical. Why raise a point as to Boswell's original title-page? Such things are of trifling consequence.

The *Oxford English Dictionary*³ when completed will be a monumental work. We have received Volume V. (H-K). This double section forms one-fourth of the letter H, and contains 1937 main words, 577 combinations explained under these, and 556 subordinate entries—in all 3070 words. The "obvious combinations" number 745 more. Several pages are devoted to the word "hand." The curious varieties of meaning of the word "harlot," originally applied to both sexes, are clearly explained.

Youth at the Prow,⁴ by E. Rentoul Esler, is a collection of short stories, some fairly well written, others very poor.

*A God Beyond All—After All*⁵ is the title of a short religious story, which has the merit of being free from unctuousness. The moral of this little tale is thoroughly good, and we congratulate Mr. Paterson on having avoided the worst fault of religiosity—cant.

*His Little Bill of Sale*⁶ is a bit of legal realism. Its object is to expose the tricks of money-lenders. It has literary merit, and, at the same time, the law is accurately stated in it. Mr. Ellis Davis has produced a really interesting and useful book.

When a person is determined to write and publish a novel regardless of expense, he (or she) manufactures a book like *A Twofold Sin*.⁷ The author ought to be a very prolific writer, for this sort of novel

¹ *The Lost Laird*. By J. E. Muddock. London: Digby, Long & Co.

² *A Critical Examination of Dr. G. Birkbeck Hill's "Johnsonian" Editions*. By Percy Fitzgerald. London: Macmillan & Co.

³ *The Oxford English Dictionary*. Vol. V. (H-K). By Dr. James A. K. Murray. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

⁴ *Youth at the Prow*. By E. Rentoul Esler. London: Digby, Long & Co.

⁵ *A God Beyond All—After All*. By A. J. B. Paterson. London: Bliss, Sands and Co.

⁶ *His Little Bill of Sale*. By Ellis J. Davis. London: John Long.

⁷ *A Twofold Sin*. By M. Brazier. London: Digby, Long & Co.

can be automatically produced with ease. Originality and character-study are entirely secondary considerations in such a book. It is written because, if one is to be called a writer, one must write something.

How I Dished the Don, and other Stories,¹ is a volume that ought to be popular just now. The author evidently has some real knowledge of Spanish life. The style is breezy and light.

POETRY.

*Erentail de Poupée*² is the title of a charming poem intended for young people. The author, M. Eddy-Levis, has the rare art of realising the mirthful spirit of childhood. Some of these French verses are inimitable, and their charm could not possibly be reproduced in an English translation. We give a specimen :

“ Lorsqu'ils étaient petits, petits,
Rosette avait une poupée,
Et par là une mignonne épée.
Qu'ils étaient heureux et gentils
Lorsqu'ils étaient petits, petits.

Ils se mariaient chaque pour
Plusieurs fois, et polichinelle
Officiait dans la chapelle :
Aux sons du fifre et du tambour
Ils se mariaient chaque pour.”

We must congratulate M. Eddy-Levis on having written such a delightful “monologue pour jeunes filles.”

¹ *How I Dished the Don, and other Stories*. By Jo Vanny. London : Digby, Long and Co.

² *Erentail de Poupée*. Monologue pour jeunes filles. Par Eddy-Levis. Paris : Librairie Théâtral.

INDEX.

AN Original Member of the Eighty Club, *The Year of Shame*, 11

Art, *Contemporary Literature of*, 113, 231, 352, 474, 594.

Ashburner, Lionel, *Political Disturbances in India*, 63.

Atkinson, A. G. B., *Reform or Disestablishment*, 17.

BAYLEE, J. Tyrrel, *Picketing*, 274.

—————, *The Army Question*, 608.

Belles Lettres, *Contemporary Literature of*, 111, 229, 349, 470, 591, 711

Boag, G. W., *Undogmatic Religion*, 450.

Bullman, G. W., *Protective Characteristics and Natural Selection*, 428.

CLARK, Stewart, 417.

Cosby, D. S. A., *The State Church*, 422.

Culloch, Rev. J. A. Mc., R. L. Stevenson—*Characteristics*, 631.

DEWAR, G. A. B., *Is Parliament so Shocking?* 324.

Didden, R., *Individualism or Collectivism, Which Way does Evolution Point?* 655.

Dowman, James, *Feasting at Funerals*, 578.

ETHELMEER, Ellis, *Feminism*, 50.

Ewen, Robert, *Cheap and Good Money*, 214.

—————, *Revolution in Money Matters*, 396.

FARLEIGH, G. Austin, *The Case of Captain Dreyfus*, 1.

—————, *Grandeur and Decadence of War*, 518.

Fothergill, Samuel, *Trade Union Tactics*, 82.

Fox, Arthur W., *A Stirring Scene in the Long Parliament*, 535.

GREEN, J. Cottle, *Americanism and the Monroe Doctrine*, 237.

HANNIGAN, D. F., *Thomas Lovell Beddoes*, 484.

Harvey, Miss, *Science as a Moral Guide*, 186.

Hewitt, J. F., *Forms and Signs of the Cross*, 248, 385, 499, 688.

History and Biography, *Contemporary Literature of*, 110, 224, 348, 466, 589, 710.

Hoppkins, T. M., *Protest against Low Works of Fiction*, 99.

Hudson, Rev. J., *Dogs in Poetry*, 289.

IGNOTA, *Judicial Sex Bias*, 147, 278.

Ilqham, Mrs. Mc., *Mary Astell, A Seventeenth Century Women's Advocate*, 440.

Irwell, Lawrence, *Practical Religion*, 564.

JOEL, J. Edmondson, *Berlin Treaty Examined in the Light of 1898* 521.

Judius, *Poets, Poetry, and Poetical Powers*, 667.

KEENE, H. G., *Home Rule in India*, 597.

- LOCKHART, R. M., Augustus Welby Pugin, 94.
 ———, Mr. Henley and Highland Mary, 332.
 Leftwich, R. W., Reading at Sight for Illiterates, 379.
- MANN, F. C. T., A Visit to Tarawera, New Zealand, 180.
 Medicine, Contemporary Literature of, 227.
 Miller, William, Payment of Members at Home and Abroad, 25.
 Montmorency, J. E. G. de, The Bond of Empire, 552.
 Murison, Robert, Heredity and the House of Lords, 405.
 Murphy, Rev. A., Intermediate Education in Ireland, 264.
- NICKLIN, J. A., Ideals of Friendship, 680.
- OAKESHOTT, B. N., Matthew Arnold as Politician and Social Critic, 161.
 Ornithology, Contemporary Literature of, 228.
- PHILOSOPHY and Theology, Contemporary Literature of, 105, 218, 340, 457, 706.
 Poetry, Contemporary Literature of, 116, 235, 473, 596, 716.
 Poole, J. Parrington, A Plea for the Liberty of the Individual, 611.
- SCIENCE, Contemporary Literature of, 103, 217, 463, 590.
 Sibley, A. W., Physical Research and the X Rays, 211.
 Sillard, P. A., Clarence Mangan and his Poetry, 648.
 Smeaton, Oliphant, Tattooing and its History, 320.
 Smith, Alexander, Development in the Idea of State, 204.
 Sociology, Politics, and Jurisprudence, Contemporary Literature of, 108, 220, 343, 459, 585, 708.
 Sykes, James, Leadership and Premiership, 357.
- TAYLOR, N. M., National Home Interests: Are they Worth Taking Care of? 73.
 Todhunter, Maurice, Ein Sterbender, 177.
 ———, Stein's Place in History, 617.
- VOYAGES AND TRAVELS, Contemporary Literature of, 109, 223, 347.
- W. S., Wanted—An Imperial Minnimum, 477.
 Wilson, Mona, Employers' Liabilities and Workmen's Compensation, 194.
 Withy, Arthur, Backward "Liberal Forwards," 365.
 Wraigh, X., Over the Border, 329.
- X., Wanted a New Lunacy Bill, 493.
 X., M.P., Parnellism and Practical Politics, 40.
- YARREOS, V. S., Freedom of Teaching in America, 8.
 Young, Stanley M., To Zola—Sonnet, 402.

